University of Alberta

Investigating the Role of Teacher Education in Promoting Innovation

by

Greg Ogilvie ©

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

Department of Secondary Education

Edmonton, Alberta
Spring 2008

Library and
Archives Canada

Published Heritage
Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et
Archives Canada

Direction du
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-45757-3
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-45757-3

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

ABSTRACT

Diffusion of innovation literature has identified numerous factors that promote and inhibit the adoption of innovations. Nonetheless, little attention has been directed towards the influence of teacher education programs in preparing prospective teachers to become innovators. This study sought to address this gap by investigating the influence of a constructivist-based curriculum course on student teachers' professional development. Using both quantitative and qualitative measures, the study investigated the influence of the course on student teachers' disposition towards an innovation and their utilization of the innovation during a teaching practicum. The findings suggest that the course increased student teachers' disposition towards the innovation, but this did not result in substantial utilization of the innovation during the practicum. The results indicate that teacher education programs have the potential to promote innovation in educational practices; however, several factors remain to be addressed including cultural norms in education and lack of support for student teachers.

This thesis is dedicated to my dear friend, Morla Milne, who passed from this world far too early. One of us had to eventually finish our thesis.

Special thanks go out to my wife, Rachelle, and son, Easton, for all their love and support. Seeing your smiling faces always made the hard work worthwhile.

Special thanks also go out to my supervisor, Dr. Bill Dunn, for his patience and support throughout the process. I really appreciate your contributions in making my experience so meaningful and rewarding.

Table of Contents

Chapter I: Introduction. 1

Research Questions. 3

Chapter II: The Innovation. 4

Introduction to Task-Based Language Teaching. 4

Clarifying Task-Based Language Teaching. 5

Theoretical Rationale for TBLT. 8

Controversial Role of Research in Informing Teachers' Practices. . . 14

A Role for SLA Research in the Classroom. 16

Summary. 18

Chapter III: Diffusion of the Innovation. 20

Issues in Implementing TBLT. 20

Literature on the Diffusion of Innovation. 23

Professional Culture and the Diffusion of Innovation. 27

Teacher Decision-Making. 36

The Time Frame of Change. 43

Summary. 44

Chapter IV: The Change Agent. 46

A Role for Teacher Education in Promoting Change. 46

Trends in Teacher Education. 49

The Traditional 'Tell, Show, Guide' Approach to Teacher Education. . . 52

Constructivist Approach to Teacher Education. 54

Summary. 59

Chapter V: Methodology. 60
  Approach. 60
  Research Site. 62
  Participants. 63
  Data Collection and Analysis. 64
Chapter VI: Case Studies. 72
  The Story of Annika. 74
  The Story of Brooke. 94
  The Story of Catriona. 110
  The Story of Deidra. 124
  The Story of Elisabeth. 140
Chapter VII: Discussion. 157
  Research Question One. 157
  Research Questions Two. 161
  Research Question Three. 164
  Implications. 171
Chapter VIII: Conclusion. 178
References. 180
Appendices. 201

List of Tables

Table One 6

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

"Teacher education still has the honour of being simultaneously the worst problem and the best solution in education" (Fullan, 1993, p.105).

The field of second language pedagogy has been characterized by constant innovation. The term innovation refers to "proposals for qualitative change in pedagogical materials, approaches, and values that are perceived as new by individuals who comprise a formal (language) education system" (Markee, 2000, p.120). In reviewing the recent history of second language instruction it is apparent that new materials, approaches, and values have been repeatedly advocated for use by teachers within the classroom (Grittner, 1990; Larsen-Freeman, 2000; Richards & Rodgers, 2001). General trends in second language education have seen pendulum-like shifts between product-oriented instruction that focuses on the provision of content as discrete linguistic items and process-oriented instruction that emphasizes the use of language for communication. These shifts have required teachers to adopt very different instructional techniques, strategies and resources; however, they have also required a significant shift in teachers' perceptions of how languages are learned and how teachers best support the learning process in the classroom. More recently a number of language teaching innovations have been developed couched within the communicative language teaching (CLT) movement, including the notional/functional syllabus, the process syllabus, the procedural syllabus, and the Natural Approach. Although each of these developments share commonalities in their philosophical orientation, they still represent several innovations, as they require a fundamental shift in planning and teaching practices.

Despite the prevalence of proposals for change within second language instruction, classroom practices continue to be based predominantly on the principles of mastery learning and Behaviourism (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). The failure of innovations to make a lasting imprint on classroom practices has been attributed to a variety of factors including institutional norms (Goddard, 2003) the influence of early established conceptions of teaching (Johnson, 1999), the intuitive appeal of traditional practices (Thornbury, 1999), and the absence of adequate time or resources to implement change (Richards & Rodgers, 2001). Markee (2000) further attributed the absence of substantive change to the failure of applied linguists to investigate the problems associated with implementing innovations in second language classrooms. He claimed that specialists from other areas, such as education and sociology, have a long tradition of innovation research and practice, but applied linguists have neglected this area assuming that the merits of the innovation would be adequate to foster change. These critiques are valuable in that they provide insight into factors that need to be considered when implementing future innovations. However, what is absent from the literature on second language learning is an investigation into the role that teacher education programs play in addressing (or maintaining) the status quo in teaching practices.

The literature on teacher education abounds with theoretical critiques of current practices (Hawkins, 2004; Britzman, 2003; Richardson, 1997; Edwards, 1996), guides to support teacher educators (Loughran, 2006; Richards & Farrell, 2005; Crookes, 2003; Johnson, 1999; Wallace, 1991), and analyses of specific techniques or programs (Fosnot, 2005a; Richards & Ho, 1998; Bailey et al., 1996; Bailey, 1996). Nonetheless, there is limited literature empirically investigating the influence of traditional and non-traditional approaches to teacher education on the professional development of pre-service teachers. This is particularly the case when it comes to the introduction of innovative approaches that are unfamiliar to student teachers. The current study seeks to address this deficiency by investigating the influence of a constructivist inspired, inquiry-based course on student teachers' professional development. More specifically, the study was designed to assess the influence of the course on students' perceptions and utilization of a theoretically supported innovation in second language instruction, task-based language teaching (TBLT).

The research questions that will be addressed in this paper are: 1) How does a constructivist based approach to teacher education influence student teachers' professional development? 2) What influence does the course have on pre-service teachers' disposition towards, and utilization of, task-based language teaching? 3) What factors influence student teachers' instructional decisions during their five-week practicum?

CHAPTER TWO: THE INNOVATION

Introduction to Task-Based Language Teaching

Task-based language teaching is an approach that emerged in the 1980s in response to traditional instruction that emphasized a product view of language (Smith, 1996). The product view of language, also referred to as a synthetic approach, "is one in which the different parts of language are taught separately and step-by-step so that acquisition is a process of gradual accumulation of the parts until the whole structure of the language has been built up" (Wilkins, 1976, p.2). Second language acquisition (SLA) research in the 1970s, in particular research relating to sequences of acquisition (see Lightbown & Spada, 1999, for a review), demonstrated that language learning is an organic, non-linear process that cannot be directly affected by external influences (Lightbown, 1985, 2000). In other words, teaching does not directly result in learning and the underlying premise of synthetic syllabi – that language can be acquired one piece at a time leading to the whole – is suspect. Based on this knowledge greater attention was directed towards a process view of language or analytic approach "in which units of language behaviour are the starting point in syllabus and course design. . . . At a later stage, if necessary, the vocabulary and grammar used for different functions can be analyzed" (Richards & Schmidt, 2002, p.535). The syllabus in this approach, therefore, was organized around the language performance (i.e. task) that was needed to meet the learners' objectives, rather than an artificially established syllabus based on carefully sequenced structures or vocabulary. Task-based language teaching is an example of an analytic approach to language instruction.

Clarifying Task-Based Language Teaching

In order to understand TBLT more thoroughly at the instructional level it is important to define the core concept of the approach – namely the task. The concept 'task' has been defined in very different ways within the literature (see Table 1). These definitions provide very divergent interpretations of the meaning of task according to the scope and function of the concept and the role of the teacher in utilizing it.

The multitude of definitions created to describe the concept of task is not inherently a complication for second language educators. Academia is wrought with examples of terms that have been defined and re-defined in order to accomplish the intended result of the author. However, what differentiates 'task' from other over-populated terms is the fact that the definitions vary so significantly that they may result in diametrically opposed practices being followed in the language classroom. For example, Prabhu's definition of task may lead to the implementation of a very structured, teacher-dominated instructional approach. In contrast, a classroom based on Ellis' notion of a task may result in a form of pedagogy in which the teacher assumes a secondary role in determining the syllabus of a course. Similarly, Breen's definition may result in an Audiolingual style classroom in which repetitive drills are used to promote language acquisition, whereas Nunan's perception of task may lead to more open-ended opportunities for communication, but which fall within a presentation-practice-production (PPP) sequence of instruction.

The concept 'task' is further complicated by the fact that it is a contextually dependent concept. According to most definitions presented in the professional literature, an activity must promote a focus on the meaningful exchange of information

Table 1: Definitions of 'Task' from the Literature

Long (1985) - "A piece of work undertaken for oneself or for others, freely or for some reward. . . In other words, by 'task' is meant the hundred and one things people do in everyday life, at work, at play, and in between" (p.89).

Breen (1987) – "Any structured language learning endeavour which has a particular objective, appropriate content, a specified working procedure, and a range of outcomes for those who undertake the task. 'Task' is therefore assumed to refer to a range of workplans which have the overall purpose of facilitating language learning – from simple and brief exercise type, to more complex and lengthy activities such as group problem-solving or simulations and decision-making" (p.23).

Prabhu (1987) - "An activity which required learners to arrive at an outcome from given information through some process of thought and which allowed teachers to control and regulate that process" (p.24).

Willis (1996) -"Tasks are always activities where the target language is used by the learners for a communicative purpose (goal) in order to achieve an outcome" (p.23).

Skehan (1998) – "A task is an activity in which: meaning is primary; there is some communication problem; there is some sort of relationship to comparable real-world activities; task completion has some priority; the assessment of the task is in terms of outcome" (p.95).

Ellis (2003) - "A task is a workplan that requires learners to process language pragmatically in order to achieve an outcome that can be evaluated in terms of whether the correct or appropriate propositional content has been conveyed. To this end, it requires them to give primary attention to meaning and to make use of their own linguistic resources, although the design of the task may predispose them to choose particular forms. A task is intended to result in language use that bears a resemblance, direct or indirect, to the way language is used in the real world. Like other language activities, a task can engage productive or receptive, and oral or written skills, and also various cognitive processes" (p.16).

Nunan (2004) - "A pedagogical task is a piece of classroom work that involves learners in comprehending, manipulating, producing or interacting in the target language while their attention is focused on mobilizing their grammatical knowledge in order to express meaning, and in which the intention is to convey meaning rather than to manipulate form" (p. 4).

Samuda (2005) – "A pedagogic task: 1) Poses some kind of challenge, relevant to the learners for whom it is intended, that needs to be met through the use and/or processing of the target language, and that gives a purpose for engaging in that language use/processing. 2) Engages aspects of language use and language processing, with the overall purpose of promoting language development. 3) Has some kind of outcome/goal/objective as an end point. 4) Has some kind of information/data/content material as a starting point. 5) Requires some kind of action to be taken on the initial data via a process of thought/transformation/manipulation as a means of reaching those outcomes" (p.234).

rather than the correct use of a particular structure to be considered a task. However, it is not the activity itself that will determine this but the manner in which it is used within an instructional episode. To illustrate this, Ur's (1988) influential book, *Grammar Practice Activities: A Practical Guide for Teachers* will be drawn upon. In the book, Ur outlines more than 100 communicative activities that are organized according to the grammatical structures that will need to be used in order to complete the activity. If used as the culminating activity in a PPP lesson, these activities would not qualify as a task because learners' attention would be directly or indirectly focused on the correct use of structures introduced earlier in the sequence. As Ellis (1997) explicates: "[learners] treat them as opportunities to practice rather than as opportunities to communicate" (p.90). In contrast, if the activities were used in isolation without explicit grammatical explanations or practice activities preceding them and if a clear communicative outcome were established, they would be considered focused tasks, which Ellis (2003) defines as "an activity that has all the qualities of a task but has been designed to induce learners' incidental attention to some specific linguistic form when processing either input or output" (p.342). Therefore, an activity cannot be classified as a task unless the circumstances in which it is used are also known.

The varied conceptions of task and the contextual dependence of the concept are significant because scholars have largely relied on definitions of task to explain task-based language teaching. For example, in his seminal work on TBLT Ellis (2003) defined task-based language teaching in the glossary as "teaching that is based entirely on tasks. Such teaching makes use of a procedural syllabus" (p.351). To address this issue the following definition will be used for task-based language teaching in this study:

> Task-based language teaching is an instructional model that addresses educational processes in a second language classroom at a philosophical (why), structural (what) and methodological (how) level. At the philosophical level TBLT assumes a view of second language acquisition as an organic process that is not directly influenced by formal instruction, but may be fostered through cognitively challenging, meaningful use of language. To this end, TBLT invites students to act as language users rather than learners, with the explicit analysis of language structures and forms supporting the task or emerging from difficulties experienced during the completion of tasks. Implied in this role is a more active responsibility for learners in determining the progression of lessons and the course. In the planning and implementation process, TBLT upholds the task as the center-piece from which all other activities are based. The task becomes both the syllabus and methodology of instruction. Completion of the task is used to evaluate the lesson, thus the focal point of TBLT is the provision of learning opportunities that reflect real world language usage, rather than pre-determined teaching points.

This definition is broad enough to encompass a variety of task-based language teaching options, such as an integrative or modular approach to instruction (Ellis, 2003). Moreover, the definition provides enough flexibility for teachers that it is not prescriptive in nature. Nonetheless, detailed guidelines and parameters for the implementation of TBLT have been provided to assist teachers with its implementation and to differentiate it with instructional practices that may only be task-based in name.

Theoretical Rationale for TBLT

Task-based language teaching has garnered significant attention in the second language literature due to its theoretical support from second language acquisition

(SLA) research. Early psycholinguistic research emphasized the important role comprehensible input serves in promoting interlanguage development. In his influential theory on language acquisition, Krashen (1982) advocated that input just above the current level of the learner (*i+1*) was the driving impetus in language acquisition. He claimed that learners draw upon two isolated systems when learning a language. The first, labeled 'learning,' was a conscious process that was developed through the explicit analysis of language structures. The second, labeled 'acquisition,' was a subconscious process initiated when the learner received comprehensible input. Although both systems were deemed to play a role in the process of becoming proficient in a second language, Krashen emphasized the importance of comprehensible input in promoting the development of the language acquisition device (LAD).

Krashen's theory assumes that input at the appropriate level will promote language acquisition as long as the individual's affective filter is low. In other words, if a person is feeling relaxed and motivated to learn, input that is just above a learner's current level will directly pass to the LAD. Similar to many other theories of its time, Krashen (1982) focused on the development of the interlanguage system at the final stages of the process, thus neglecting the initial stages of perception and comprehension. Chaudron (1985) among others have addressed this by noting the importance of intake as a concept in second language acquisition. He defined intake as "the mediating process between the target language available to learners as input and the learners' internalized set of L2 rules and strategies for second language development" (Chaudron, 1985, p.1). Schmidt (1990) further developed the concept by hypothesizing that intake is the part of input learners notice. His hypothesis was based on his experiences learning Portuguese in which he found a correlation between the forms he noticed and identified in a journal he kept and the forms he acquired and was able to use (Schmidt & Frota, 1986). He thus concluded that noticing is a critical element of the process of acquisition, mitigating the divide between the input provided and the internal processes associated with language development. Schmidt's work was significant for SLA research because it broadened the focus from the simple provision of comprehensible input to the development of situations in which particular linguistic features would be noticed.

Gass (1988) also advocated the importance of the process of noticing or what she labeled 'apperception.' Apperception is an internal cognitive act that identifies linguistic input as being related to some prior knowledge that is stored in one's memory. According to Gass, apperceived input is the first step in which input is converted into output. She used the concept to advocate what has been commonly labeled as the 'weak interface' position (Ellis, 1997). The weak interface position suggests that explicit grammar instruction does not directly promote language acquisition but may play a role in the process by acting as a stimulus for selectively attending to particular linguistic features in the input provided. Thus, her theory provided further support for noticing as a key element of language acquisition.

Although early research focused on the role of input in language acquisition, SLA researchers also began to recognize the influence of interaction on language development. Swain (cited in Mitchell & Myles, 2004) noted that immersion students who had been exposed to comprehensible input for numerous years did not possess the skills of a native speaker in many areas. What she identified as being lacking in the program was the opportunity for comprehensible output. Based on these findings Swain (2000) developed the 'Output Hypothesis,' which ascribed three functions for learner output: consciousness-raising, hypothesis testing, and a reflective role. In relation to the first function, Swain and Lapkin (1995) noted that production using the target language would on occasion make the speaker aware of linguistic problems, which then pushed them to modify their output. This process of output modification was deemed important in triggering the mental processes associated with interlanguage development.

Long (1983) also advocated interaction as an important element of second language acquisition but based his claim on a different rationale. In a study of interaction between pairs of native speakers and a native speaker with a non-native speaker, Long found that there was little difference in terms of the language produced based on its grammatical complexity. However, what was significantly different between the two conversation groups was the repeated use of conversational tactics (i.e. confirmation checks, repetitions, and clarification requests) to ensure that communication did not break down. Based on his findings, Long established the 'Interaction Hypothesis' that posited negotiation as an essential element in ensuring that the input received was comprehensible for second language learners.

The aforementioned SLA research was significant in providing a theoretical basis for the implementation of TBLT. Research on language acquisition sequences (see Lightbown & Spada, 1999, for a review) provided the impetus for discrediting synthetic approaches to language instruction; however, research on the processes that promote language acquisition offered guidance in the establishment of TBLT. Tasks introduced in the classroom provide learners with a wealth of comprehensible input from which to promote language acquisition. The input is provided not only by the teacher but also by students who are at a similar level of language development. Richards (2005) noted that this might be beneficial as language samples provided by native speakers are often too advanced to be comprehensible for learners, whereas, the features of language produced by non-native speakers are more likely to be at a level where they can be noticed by other non-native speakers and promote interlanguage development.

Moreover, the type of interaction characteristic of a TBLT classroom has been demonstrated to be beneficial in promoting language acquisition. Ellis, Tanaka, and Yamazaki (1994) investigated the effects of interactionally modified input on the acquisition of vocabulary. The authors found that interaction assisted in the comprehension of new vocabulary by giving learners control over the input received. They also concluded that interactionally modified input facilitated acquisition of more word order meanings than pre-modified input. Similar findings were found by Mackey (1999), who investigated the influence of interaction (opportunities for negotiation) on learners' development in relation to question formation. She concluded that interaction enabled learners to produce higher level question forms and facilitated movement to a higher developmental level. In contrast, students who simply observed interaction demonstrated modest gains but which did not result in significant development. The efficacy of interactionally based tasks was further supported by Keck, Iberri-Shea, Tracy-Ventura, and Wa-Mbaleka (2006) in their meta-analysis of task-based studies in the literature. Applying stringent criteria to task-based studies found in the literature between 1980 and 2003, Keck et al. narrowed their analysis to thirteen applicable studies. From these thirteen studies, the authors concluded that interaction significantly affected acquisition of both grammatical and lexical features compared with tasks that did not involve a component of interaction.

While classrooms structured around task-based language teaching have been found to be efficacious in promoting acquisition through the provision of comprehensible input and opportunities for interaction, a common concern has revolved around the development of accuracy and complexity in language usage (Skehan, 1996). Skehan (1998a) noted that attentional resources are limited; therefore, learners cannot simultaneously address the three areas of fluency, accuracy and complexity. He advocated that this issue could be addressed by implementing tasks in such a way as to manipulate attentional focus. One way of accomplishing this is by using stages in a TBLT lesson (Bygate, 1999). For example, in Willis' (1996) model of TBLT the three stages in a cycle can be manipulated to shift attentional focus between the three areas. Researchers have also demonstrated that attentional focus may be manipulated by providing time for planning (Foster, 1996; Foster & Skehan, 1996; Mehnert, 1998) and repeating tasks (Bygate, 1996, 1999).

The efficacy of TBLT in developing students' grammatical competence was further demonstrated by Moser (2007). On a program wide basis TBLT was adopted by instructors at the Osaka Shoin Women's University in Japan in 2005. The head of curriculum at the university identified that the shift to a task-based program had resulted in early difficulties with students focusing exclusively on the fluent use of language (Moser, 2005). However, by using language journals that emphasized the various stages and foci of a task-based lesson, instructors were able to create a balance between accuracy and fluency. The end result was that students demonstrated across the board improvements on an international standardized test, including their ability to use language accurately. This is significant because the program had previously been based on instruction that emphasized grammatical correctness.

Controversial Role of Research in Informing Teachers' Practices

The fact that TBLT is supported by SLA research has not convinced some scholars of its usefulness in a second language classroom (see for example Freeman & Richards, 1993; Freeman & Johnson, 1998). For these scholars the role of research in informing teachers' practices is controversial. Research is generally associated with the notion of 'theory' as sophisticated, abstract ideas that have been established or verified based on scientific criteria. This perception posits theory as something established by academics and researchers in order to clarify or expand thinking but disjointed from the practical experiences of individuals. This notion of theory as an abstract construct (labeled 'THEORY') has been contrasted by Edelsky (1996) with a more practically driven, experientially based form of the term (which she named 'theory'). This latter form of theory has been generally recognized as a major influence on teachers' classroom practices (see for example Johnson, 1999). However, the role of research-driven theory - which will simply be labeled as 'theory' for the remainder of this paper - in influencing teachers' practices, has been highly contested.

Advocates of a socio-cultural basis for teacher education (see for example Hawkins, 2004; Johnson, 2006) believe theory derived from research is of limited value to teachers as it is based on findings from a laboratory setting that bears little resemblance to the classrooms in which teachers operate (Kennedy, 1997). Laboratory studies focus on the learning process of individuals in isolation. This is significantly removed from the interactive, social classroom environments in which teachers typically work. Moreover, the individualist perspective adopted by this research ignores the socially negotiated, constructivist processes involved in learning (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Markee (1997b) claimed that the absence of consideration for socio-cultural factors as intervening variables has undermined the effectiveness of research in guiding teachers' practices.

According to advocates of this perspective the relevance of second language acquisition research for teaching practitioners is further undermined by difficulties in applying it to a practical setting. Freeman and Johnson (1998) wrote: "Because the research knowledge per se does not articulate easily and cogently into classroom practice, much current knowledge in SLA may be of limited use and applicability to practicing teachers" (p.411). Adopting a cognitive-psychological perspective, Korthagen and Kessels (1999) explained this phenomenon as the incompatibility of the knowledge presented by research and the knowledge required by teachers in their day-to-day existence. They stated that teachers need concrete answers to situations in which split second decisions must be made. However, the type of knowledge presented by research is typically abstract, systematized and general. The research does not explain how findings relate to the individual and, therefore, how it can be adapted to specific situations (Gass, 1995). The result is that practicing teachers often do not find SLA research worth reading because the ideas presented are too disjointed from the day-to-day concerns of their classrooms (Eykin, 1987).

In contrast to the conceptual knowledge (theory) provided by research, Kessels and Korthagen (1996) advocate the development of perceptual knowledge as the central component of teacher education. Perceptual knowledge (labeled as 'phronesis' by the authors) is practical wisdom developed through an understanding of the intricacies of concrete situations. It is this knowledge of specific classroom contexts that guides teachers' practices and enables them to address the specific episodes they encounter on a daily basis. Based on this perspective, Johnson (2006) has advocated the socio-cultural turn in teacher education; a change that ascribes greater value to the idiosyncratic, contextually based knowledge that teachers utilize in their professional experiences.

A Role for SLA Research in the Classroom

Although this dissenting perspective provides valuable insight into some of the weaknesses of research design and reporting practices and the need for expanding the knowledge base that is valued in teacher education programs, it does not provide an adequate rationale for diminishing the contributions of theory to teachers' decision making. Learning, regardless of the subject matter, is a complex, multi-faceted endeavor that cannot be easily described or analyzed. The fact that numerous learning models (behaviourist, cognitive, and socio-cultural to name a few) have found support in education circles is testament to the complexity of the process. Due to its complex nature, the learning process cannot be holistically captured but must be simplified by targeting isolated variables that influence it. Therefore, the fact that SLA research focuses on individual learning processes should not be viewed as a criticism of its value, but rather a necessary byproduct of increasing our understanding about such a complex entity.

Moreover, the fact that theoretical knowledge does not always convert cogently into the classroom does not undermine its value. Theory provides insights that may promote a paradigmatic shift resulting in the eventual adoption of novel approaches. Richardson (1994) explained: "Formal research provides us with new and useful ways of thinking about teaching, and may eventually enter into teachers' practical reasoning and affect their practices" (p.6). In other words, the absence of an overt correlation between theory and practice should not be considered a condemnation of theory, as the first step in promoting practical change is expanding practitioners' frontier of knowledge.

In addition to testing the boundaries of professional thinking, theory also provides general guidelines to assist teachers in crafting productive learning episodes. Critics who question the value of theory based on its inability to provide direct answers for teachers erroneously assume that theoretical knowledge should inform teachers' practices on a macro and micro level. Theory cannot directly contribute to decision-making on a micro level, as theoretical knowledge is abstract and general and, therefore, cannot be utilized without specific contextual knowledge. However, on a macro level, theory informs teachers' practices by supporting the establishment of general principles. The knowledge derived at this level provides the basis from which to establish strategies that will be used in a specific classroom setting. According to Winitzky and Kauchak (1997) this foundational knowledge is essential for a novice teacher, who otherwise "has nothing but a wish and a prayer to guide her actions" (p.61). In contrast to the perceptual knowledge developed through experiential learning, theoretical knowledge may be applied in various manners to different contexts. Anderson, Reder and Simon (1996) claimed that well-learned abstract knowledge has great value because it can be applied to a variety of situations. They noted a study in which mathematics students were able to apply the knowledge derived from abstract instruction to solve a novel problem, whereas students taught the same concept using a concrete method were unable to successfully complete the related task. Therefore, the strength of theoretical knowledge and the value it has for teachers is based on the fact that it is not directly tied to a particular context but may be applied with discretion to a variety of contexts.

This does not mean that theory is the authoritative source of information that should influence teachers' instructional decisions. However, theory does provide a valuable source of information about second language teaching and learning that can assist educators in developing and assessing classroom practices (Saville-Troika, 2006). Cook (2001) wrote: "Teachers need to see the classroom from many angles . . . The choice of what to do in a particular lesson depends upon the teacher's assessment of the factors involved in teaching *those* students in *that* situation. SLA reveals some of the strengths and weaknesses of a particular teaching method or technique and it provides information that can influence and guide teaching" (p.11). Thus, SLA research offers one valuable source for evaluating the appropriacy of classroom activities.

Summary

Task-based language teaching is a widely advocated approach to teaching second languages. Research on how second languages are acquired has demonstrated that tasks promote optimal situations for the development of communicative competence. Arguments have been presented that question the value of research conducted in artificial settings on teachers' practices; however, these arguments neglect the important role that such research can play in providing a source of criteria in evaluating classroom practices. Moreover, they don't provide an adequate rationale for not implementing TBLT, in particular when TBLT has been empirically proven to develop students' linguistic abilities.

CHAPTER THREE: DIFFUSION OF THE INNOVATION

Issues in Implementing TBLT

TBLT has garnered substantial attention due to its close relationship with SLA research. Nonetheless, it has not made a significant imprint on classroom practices (Kumaravadivelu, 2006; Davies, 2007). The literature on issues in implementing task-based language teaching is scarce due to its relatively recent origins. Nonetheless, several key factors have been identified to explain the continued prominence of the presentation-practice-production sequence of instruction.

Richards and Rodgers (2001) suggested that the absence of significant resources designed for task-based language teaching poses a significant problem because it requires teachers to design their own materials, a significant burden for teachers whose time is already taxed. This was supported by Carless (2003) who identified added workload as a constraint for the teachers in his study. Nonetheless, he cautioned that the textbook designed for the Hong Kong context reduced the amount of time required of teachers to develop their own materials.

Student expectations have also been identified as an issue with the implementation of TBLT (Willis, 1996). McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) noted initial resistance from students when a task-based syllabus was adopted in an institute in Thailand. Student resistance was based on dissonance between the instruction received and students' expectations that grammar would be the focus of the class. Such an expectation has been found to be prevalent in numerous contexts. In a study of second language students in the United States and Colombia, Schulz (2001) found that students from both countries strongly supported explicit grammar instruction and corrective feedback. Although McDonough and Chaikitmongkol (2007) acknowledged students' perceptions as an issue, they noted that the focus of the course on developing learning strategies that could be applied outside the classroom and attempts to help students understand the benefits of a task-based syllabus helped to curb this issue.

While students' perceptions of the innovation were considered to be a significant impediment, students' linguistic abilities were also noted as a problem. Carless (2004) raised concerns over the utilization of TBLT with younger students. He wrote: "If English language structures are not pretaught, then beginning learners will probably not have sufficient English language to use during tasks and may have no alternative other than to complete the task using the MT [mother tongue]" (Carless, 2004, p.658). This issue was noted by teachers in the Hong Kong context as a significant drawback to the utilization of TBLT (Carless, 2002).

Related to the use of the mother tongue during task completion, classroom management was identified as a major issue in utilizing tasks as the basis of instruction. Carless (2004) observed tensions in the classrooms he observed between aspirations to carry out activities and desires to maintain a quiet, orderly classroom. Carless (2002) noted that teachers struggled to find a balance between utilizing communicative tasks and maintaining discipline in the classroom. This was particularly the case in larger classes when it was easy for students to misbehave or for the volume in the classroom to become excessive.

Finally, current testing practices have been identified as an impediment to implementing TBLT (Ellis, 2003). Carless (2002) explained that the education system in Hong Kong utilized traditional pencil and paper tests as the primary measure of students' performance in language classrooms. This places an emphasis on written skills, which is not aligned with the emphasis placed on listening and speaking skills in a task-based approach. Thus, teachers were left with the dilemma of teaching to the test or risking poor exam scores by following the government sanctioned task-based approach to teaching.

In addition to the extensive reasons provided for difficulties in implementing TBLT, several authors have also postulated rationales for the perpetuation of the presentation-practice-production (PPP) sequence of instruction in second language classrooms. According to Thornbury (1999), the prevalence of PPP in second language classrooms is based on its logical appeal: "[PPP] has a logic that is appealing both to teachers and learners, and it reflects the way that other skills – such as playing tennis or using a computer – are learned. That is, knowledge becomes skill through successive stages of practice" (p.128). PPP thus creates the perception that content is stable and can be acquired through repeated opportunities to practice. This serves to de-mystify the learning process, an appealing proposition for both teachers and learners in the classroom.

Moreover, the PPP sequence of instruction is attractive to educators because it provides a clear professional role for teachers that is relatively easy to maintain (Skehan, 1996). In a PPP classroom the teacher is upheld as the expert who controls learning episodes. Teachers do not have to possess extensive linguistic knowledge because they control the content and flow of the lesson. Thus, teachers may avoid the anxiety associated with more student-centered approaches while still promoting a communicative environment. Moreover, numerous teaching techniques and resources have been designed for use within the PPP classroom. These resources reduce the burden on teachers' creativity and alleviate time constraints associated with planning.

Skehan (1998) also noted that PPP is coherent with current trends towards accountability. PPP is based on the introduction of isolated linguistic items followed by numerous opportunities for automatization through repeated practice. This approach lends itself to the establishment of clear outcomes, with the result that testing is seen as unproblematic. Furthermore, syllabus planning is simplified because learner constraints are not viewed as significant in influencing the units of syllabus design.

Literature on the Diffusion of Innovation

The literature on the implementation of TBLT has provided evidence about some of the more salient issues in utilizing the innovation in the classroom. Markee (1997b) advocated that diffusion of innovation literature also provides valuable insights into some of the potential issues facing school systems, institutions and teachers attempting to innovate with the approach. His analysis is based on identifying 'who adopts what, where, when, why and how?' The previous chapter addressed the content of the innovation; this section will look at relevant literature in relation to how and why innovations are adopted.

Chin and Benne (cited in Bonner, Koch, & Langmeyer, 2004) identified three strategies for implementing innovation. The power-coercive strategy is a top-down strategy based on the use of political, economic, or moral sanctions to bring about successful implementation. The strategy is often used when inertia exists in a system or quick changes need to be brought about. Although the strategy is effective in providing the impetus for change, it is unlikely to promote long-term change in the behaviour of individuals or systems (Lamie, 2005). Furthermore, the combative nature of the strategy risks undermining a collaborative environment and positive relations among workers. Kennedy (1987) wrote: "The group at whom the change is directed may then resort to power-coercive strategies themselves, and a circle of conflict is initiated" (p.164).

In contrast to the confrontational nature of the power-coercive strategy, the rational-empirical strategy is based on promoting change through providing information about the innovation. Advocates of the strategy assume that individuals are rational beings and the provision of information about the benefits of an innovation will promote change. Kennedy (1987) noted that this assumption is problematic because it is based on the assumption that knowledge of potential gains rather than a demonstration of the advantages of an innovation is adequate to promote change. The result is that the strategy "is likely to have its greatest effect when the audience is already sympathetic to the arguments produced" (Kennedy, 1987, p.164).

The third strategy is the normative re-educative strategy. Unlike the unidirectional view of change promoted by the first two strategies, the normative re-educative strategy advocates that meaningful change will only occur if a collaborative, problem-solving approach is adopted. Change is perceived as a complex process that involves not only a change in behaviour but also a change in individual's personal beliefs and attitudes. This perspective coincides with the literature on beliefs and cognition. Nespor (1987) suggests that teachers' beliefs act as a filter and a foundation when new information is being processed. As a result, existing beliefs frame how new information is perceived. Therefore, empirical data that is incongruent with an individual's beliefs may not have an effect on the individual because it may have been altered during the interpretation stage. Kagan (1992a) claims that change is difficult to enact because "pre-existing beliefs are tenacious, even in the face of contradictory evidence" (p.76). As a result, "individuals tend to hold on to beliefs based on incorrect or incomplete knowledge, even after scientifically correct explanations are presented to them" (Pajares, 1992, p.325). The normative re-educative strategy thus does not force change on participants but involves them in the process of determining the degree and manner in which an innovation will be implemented. This strategy is concerned more with the process of development than the promotion of a particular innovation to be used.

In addition to strategies for introducing change, the literature also provides various models for the diffusion of innovation. The research development and diffusion (RDD) method is a top-down approach that begins with applied research and development followed by large-scale production, dissemination and application. This model assumes that innovative practices developed by experts will be easily translated into classroom practices. The RDD model of diffusion is rapid and efficient, which is likely why it is the most commonly drawn upon method of promoting innovation (Lamie, 2005). Schwartz (2002) commented that the RDD approach has been commonly used in the field of second language education to disseminate the communicative language teaching approach through the development of textbooks. Despite the benefits of rapid dissemination, the RDD approach has a number of drawbacks. Without opportunities to question innovations and work through difficulties, a form of 'pedagogical perversion' often takes place in which teachers implement innovations on a surface level without adjusting the principles underlying their practice (Woodward, 1996). A further complication is the fact that teachers are so far removed from the origins of the new approach that they do not assume ownership of the products of the innovation (Markee, 1997a).

The social interaction model is also a center-periphery method of disseminating new materials or approaches; however, it is based on involving teachers as change agents. Within the model teachers are recruited to receive training on a particular innovation. These trained experts then return to their school divisions or schools and disseminate the innovation among their fellow teachers. Lamie (2005) described the method using the analogy of a champagne fountain: "As knowledge comes down from the top, it spreads and involves more and more recipients, rather like a champagne fountain in which all glasses become filled eventually, simply by filling the top one" (p.46). This method is based less on the imposition of change than the RDD model and it provides opportunities for understandings of the innovation to be socially mediated. Nonetheless, ownership is limited by the fact that the innovation was developed by an external body.

The last model of diffusion is the problem-solving model. Unlike the two previous models, which are based on disseminating an innovation developed by a central body, the problem-solving method is a bottom-up approach that draws on teachers' perceived needs. The model is based on the premise that self-initiated innovation will invoke strong commitment on the part of teachers, resulting in long-term benefits. Nonetheless, Schwartz (2002) identified several drawbacks to the approach, including the dearth of resources and the potential for the innovation to encounter resistance from students, parents and other interested individuals due to its lack of official sanction.

The strategies and models are neither mutually exclusive nor synonymous with each other. For example, within a research development and dissemination tradition a power-coercive strategy could be applied by sanctioning the use of the innovation but a rational-empirical strategy could also be used by providing information that would describe the benefits of the approach. Markee (2000) commented that the models and strategies 'pair up' in the application of any innovation. He also cautioned that no model or strategy is inherently superior, but rather change agents should apply a hybrid model depending on the innovation, timing of implementation and context.

Professional Culture and the Diffusion of Innovation

The model and strategy used to introduce an innovation will have a significant influence on the process of change; however, the collective professional culture of a school will influence the extent to which innovation will be adopted. Hargreaves (1992) claimed that promoting change in behaviour in any organization involves changing the culture of the organization. Furthermore, he identified two critical components of the culture of any organization, the content and the form. Hargreaves (1992) defined the content of teacher cultures as "the substantive attitudes, values, beliefs, habits, assumptions and ways of doing things that are shared within a particular teacher group, or among the wider teacher community" (p.219). These are the areas where change needs to occur for innovations to really have an effect. According to Hargreaves, the content of a teaching culture is unlikely to change unless the form of the culture changes first. The form of teacher cultures "consists of the characteristic patterns of relationship and forms of association between members of those cultures" (Hargreaves, 1992, p.219). Therefore, in order for an innovation to promote significant change in teachers' practices, the ways in which teachers socialize must also be addressed.

Hargreaves identified four common cultural forms. The most common form associated with teacher cultures is individualism. Schools with an individualistic culture are characterized by isolated working conditions and lack of collaborative initiative. Classroom isolation offers teachers a reprieve from outside interference and protects them from criticism. However, the presentism, conservatism and individualism associated with the culture inhibit the potential for professional growth. Hargreaves noted that individualistic schools are often characterized by their staff room solidarity. Conversations primarily revolve around non-professional, non-intellectual topics, thus, maintaining the appearance of autonomy within the classroom.

Balkanization is the second form of culture identified by Hargreaves. Balkanization occurs when a school staff is splintered into numerous sub-cultures based on teaching subjects or common interests. Balkanization inhibits vertical (between different levels) and horizontal (between different subjects) communication and undermines initiatives for school wide improvement. Moreover, balkanized school cultures promote competition between the various groups, thus undermining a truly collaborative environment.

The third form of culture is collaborative. Collaborative cultures are not formally organized, bureaucratic, or based on the adoption of a particular innovation.

On the contrary they are based on genuine bonds between teachers based on support, trust and openness. In contrast to individualistic cultures, failure and uncertainty are not hidden or defended but shared and discussed in order to initiate the process of eliciting support to improve the situation. Hargreaves contended that collaborative cultures are rare because they require considerable time to foster and effort and patience on the part of teachers and administrators to develop. As a result, the author believed that bounded collaboration is more likely to occur in which collaborative efforts are restricted in scope, frequency and depth. This form of collaboration concentrates on more immediate concerns such as material sharing rather than attending to more substantial issues such as the ethics of practice.

Finally, contrived collegiality was identified as a common school culture. As the name suggests, contrived collegiality occurs when teachers are mandated to work collaboratively based on a specific time and space. Hargreaves contended that contrived collegiality may act as an effective starting point for developing staff relations, but long-term benefits will not be accrued by such a culture because it is based on a synthetic structure that does not attend to the individual needs of the teachers.

The form of culture in a particular school or system is imperative to any effort for innovation because collaboration and interaction are key ingredients of change. Nias, Southworth and Campbell (1992) explained that the motivation to change comes from within a teacher; however, interaction serves three important functions: to promote enthusiasm for learning, to provide emotional support to take risks, and to enhance learning through sharing and questioning ideas. Spillane (1999) expressed a similar sentiment stating that once an innovation had been initiated, the enactment zone of the reform would determine the success or failure of the change. The author defined enactment zones as the “space in which reform levers meet the world of practitioners and ‘practice’, involving the interplay of teachers’ personal resources with external incentives and learning opportunities” (Spillane, 1999, p.171). Borrowing from the theories of Vygotsky and Brown, Spillane (1999) stated that zones of enactment are “concerned with the distance between teachers’ current practice and understandings of practice and levels of understanding and practice that can be accomplished through the collaboration with others using a variety of material artifacts” (p.171). Therefore, the more opportunities teachers have to implement curricular reform with collegial support, the more likely they are to adjust their practices. Sprinthall, Reiman, and Thies-Sprinthall (1996) concur, stating that collaboration is requisite because “teacher development will not occur unilaterally” (p.697). Spillane (1999) noted that collegial support may assume a variety of forms including discussions about practice, lesson observations followed by feedback, attendance at professional conferences or workshops, and the sharing of resources.

While the professional culture of specific schools will influence the instructional practices of teachers, the structure of teacher education programs will also significantly influence student teachers’ professional activities. Cochran-Smith (1991) identified three common structures of teacher education programs that are based on different principles and goals. ‘Consonance’ is the term used by the author to describe teacher education programs in which university courses and practical field experiences are consistent with each other in promoting the same values. Consistency is established by promoting a strong relationship between theory and practice and ensuring that the language and messages conveyed by the university and school are coordinated. This may seem like an ideal situation; however, in establishing a relationship of consonance, value is ascribed to knowledge presented by the university, thus establishing the hegemony of the university and ignoring the professional knowledge generated by practitioners. According to Cochran-Smith (1991) this inhibits opportunities for teachers to initiate innovation: "This sends a potent message to prospective school-based teachers that their own chances to be generators of knowledge, agents for change, and genuine decision-makers are circumscribed by outside-of-school expertise on teaching and learning" (p.107). As a result, the dichotomy between theory and practice is not resolved, but rather glossed over by ascribing value to the theory and practice advocated by the university.

The second form of teacher education program identified was critical dissonance. Similar to a program based on consonance, critical dissonance ascribes value to the knowledge generated by the university. In contrast to the other structure; however, critical dissonance is based on a deficit view of schools as conservative entities that adversely influence pre-service teacher development by promoting traditional views and practices. The relationship between schools and teacher education programs is viewed as adversarial in that teacher education programs attempt to disrupt the influence of taken-for-granted notions of education promoted in schools by critically analyzing school practices. The portrayal of schools as stifling cultures of conservatism promotes the view that change can only be identified and enacted from the outside. The result is that pre-service teachers are encouraged to critique the system that they shortly will be assimilated into.

The third approach to teacher education is collaborative resonance. This model is based on the establishment of learning communities consisting of teacher educators, teachers and pre-service teachers. Nonetheless, it differs from programs based on consonance in a key manner. "What distinguishes this model from that of consonance is that the members of these communities work *collaboratively* to critique existing practices and to make substantive changes in the teaching and learning that occurs in schools" (Hudelson & Faltis, 1993, p. 26). In other words, teachers are given a voice to contribute to dialogue about school change. In this context innovation is initiated and supported by all members of the learning community. As such the procedural (practical) knowledge of teachers is viewed as being equally as valuable as the propositional (theoretical) knowledge associated with the university.

Of the three models presented it should be apparent that the collaborative resonance approach offers the greatest promise in promoting meaningful change. It is the only model that values the contributions of professional practitioners and allows for true collaboration that is unaffected by dynamics of power and control. Nonetheless, it is the most challenging to establish due to the fact that it requires the mutual collaboration of multiple groups with divergent interests and investments in the process of change.

Although Cochran-Smith (1991) claimed that all three versions of teacher education have been enacted, the author acknowledged the dominance of consonance and critical dissonance models. This is supported in the literature by the portrayal of teacher education programs as sites of tension between the theory advocated in pre-service courses and the practice enjoyed during practical field experiences. Chubbuck et al. (2001) claimed that the link between teacher education institutes and the schools in which the trainees would be hired has been traditionally weak or non-existent. Karavas-Doukas (1998) noted teacher dissatisfaction with training programs that focused too much on theory and failed to establish bridges with practical applications. This demonstrated that teachers do not perceive of theory and practice as being mutually informed through the process of praxis, likely a result of tacit messages relayed throughout their professional preparation. Shulman (1998) further established the weak link between universities and schools by asserting that the standards and conceptions of practice advocated in teacher education programs conflicted with those typically manifested in the field. He wrote: "Typically once the professionals reach the field of practice, they look back on the theoretical preparation and begin to devalue it" (Shulman, 1998, p.518). He claimed this has resulted in many practitioners admonishing pre-service teachers to "forget all the nonsense they were taught at the university because now [during the practicum] they will learn the way it is really done" (Ibid). This attitude is a clear manifestation of the weak connection between sites of theoretical learning and practical application.

The tension between theory and practice created when a truly collaborative relationship has not been established between schools and teacher education institutes has significant implications for the development of prospective teachers. First, it undermines the importance of praxis in professional development. According to Kolb's 'experiential learning cycle' model (cited in Waters, 2005) teacher development is a cyclical process based on interaction between practical experiences and theoretical understandings. Reflective observation based on concrete experiences contributes to abstract conceptualizations. These conceptualizations, in turn, are acted upon in experimentation within a practical setting. Thus, theory and practice are mutually bound and act as the impetus for developing the other. Hoffman-Kipp and Olsen (2007) wrote: "beginning teachers can develop a praxis that both informs their practice with theory and, that leads them to realize a new understanding of theory as a result of engaging in their practice" (p.142). If either source of development is devalued or neglected, as is the case in the consonance and critical dissonance approaches to teacher education, the cycle will be broken and the potential for professional growth undermined.

Second, the division between schools and teacher education institutes undermines the coherence of initial professional development and creates a tension that must be resolved by student teachers. According to Johnson (1996) most teacher education programs promote a view of teaching grounded primarily in theory without embodying the realities of the classroom. This results in the development of teaching identities and philosophies that are not necessarily well-suited nor tenable in the contexts in which student teaching will take place. Under such circumstances, novice teachers are confronted with the challenge of balancing their vision of teaching with the reality of the classroom. For the student teacher in Johnson's (1996) study the tension between expectations and the reality of the classroom led to feelings of frustration. According to Clark and Peterson (1986), feelings of helplessness and incompetence are natural results of a teacher education program that advocates practices that are not easily applied to the classroom. However, frustration is not conducive to a productive state of professional growth because human nature is to resolve tensions by reverting to what is familiar and comfortable (Bailey et al., 1996). Based on a review of learning-to-teach studies Kagan (1992b) concurred with this conclusion: "Quickly disillusioned and possessing inadequate procedural knowledge, novice teachers tend to grow increasingly authoritarian and custodial. Obsessed with class control, novices may also begin to plan instruction designed, not to promote learning, but to discourage misbehaviour" (p.145). Thus, the division between theory and practice may serve to hinder innovation.

Finally, tension between theory and practice often results in greater value being given by pre-service teachers to the procedural knowledge established during the act of doing (Britzman, 2003). Shulman (1998) wrote: "[Theories are] so remote from the particular conditions of professional practice that the novice professional-in-training rarely appreciates their contributions" (p.517). Furthermore, the expert in the domain to which pre-service teachers aspire is the classroom teacher. Therefore, the procedural knowledge possessed by the practicing teacher is often given precedence over the theoretical knowledge advocated at the university. This is significant in relation to the implementation of innovative practices because schools are organizations with conservative tendencies. In an analysis of curriculum reform in numerous countries Rudduck (1991) found consistency in one particular theme – the ability of schools to circumvent curricular innovation. This caused her to conclude: "What we are up against, I suggest, is the tenacious conservatism of institutions" (Rudduck, 1991, p.28). In an analysis of four high schools in the United States McNeil (1988) came to a similar conclusion. She found that teachers maintained simplistic, traditional practices as a response to the structures of the school. Even if teachers possessed an ethic for reform, McNeil (1988) noted "their instructional strategies embodied the very value they wished to avoid in teaching-by-objective models" (p.185). Both McNeil and Rudduck noted that students are also agents of conservatism, using the threat of inappropriate behaviour as an implicit negotiation tool with teachers to maintain familiar (and often unchallenging) practices within the classroom. The end result for student teachers is that focusing on the technical mastery of skills within the classroom, the skills associated with the current culture of schools, will undermine the ability of the novice educator to gain a deep understanding of the principles inherent in her practices and the facility to evoke meaningful change.

Despite the strong influence of the context of teaching, the decision to undertake a particular action in the classroom is an individual one. Thus, in order to understand the substance and rationale behind novice teachers' practices, it is also important to draw on the teacher decision-making literature.

Teacher Decision-Making

Teacher decision-making is a complex, multi-faceted area of study that has produced a number of insights. The various studies dedicated to understanding the influences on teachers' practices have demonstrated that instructional decisions are contextually based and influenced by diverse factors. Malderez and Bodoczky (1999) used an iceberg metaphor to describe the various influences on teachers' practices. At the surface level the school climate and educational system affect and are affected by the professional behaviours of the teacher. These professional behaviours are the manifestation of a number of more subtle influences that are not overtly apparent. The internal factors identified by the authors are presented in a hierarchy. At the highest level are teachers' knowledge about pupils, the content of instruction, and instructional strategies. This knowledge directly impacts the planning process. Just below are teachers' conceptualizations about education, the teaching-learning process, professionalism, and language acquisition. Finally at the deepest level are found the general beliefs, attitudes and values of the teacher. These internal factors are not autonomous but rather are influenced by external factors, including the cultural norms of society. Each of the elements of the model is interwoven, contributing to the eventual instructional behaviour of the teacher.

Malderez and Bodoczky's (1999) model is useful because it provides an overview of the various influences on teachers' instructional practices. One of the influences that has been prominent in the literature on teacher decision-making is teachers' beliefs. Beliefs have been defined in various manners in the literature; however, most classifications of the concept acknowledge its influence on teachers' perceptions (Nespor, 1987; Kagan, 1992a) and actions (Richardson, 1996; Williams & Burden, 1997). Sercu and St. John (2007) wrote: "Beliefs govern the integrity of human action by supplying some kind of rationale for it. People do things because they believe them to be 'right', reasonable, necessary or beneficial in some way" (p.49). Numerous studies investigating the instructional practices of teachers have linked belief systems with the activities undertaken in the class. In an investigation of instructors at a post-secondary institution, Prosser and Trigwell (1999) noted a close relationship between the instructional approach adopted and the teachers' conceptions of teaching and learning. Teachers who adopted a teacher-centered approach to teaching predominantly viewed their role as transmitting knowledge embodied by the syllabus or their personal expertise. In contrast, teachers who utilized a more student-centered approach viewed their role in the education process as being one of helping students come to particular understandings.

A close relationship between beliefs and instructional practices was also found by Johnson (1992b). In her study of ESL teachers, Johnson noted a consistent correlation between teachers' beliefs about literacy education and their instructional practices. Differences in theoretical beliefs resulted in differences in the nature of instruction undertaken in the classroom. Woods (1991) concluded that instructional decisions were coherent with underlying beliefs for two teachers in his longitudinal study. He found that the teachers' planning and implementation were consistent with underlying beliefs about language, learning and teaching and markedly different from each other. Therefore, the one student followed what was labeled a "curriculum-based" view of teaching, while the other prescribed to a "student-based" view. Similar conclusions were also made by Smith (1996). In her study of teacher decision-making in an ESL classroom, Smith found that beliefs were theoretically eclectic but consistent with teachers' instructional decisions. Teachers who considered accuracy and grammatical knowledge to be integral parts of a language classroom designed the syllabus of the course to revolve around structures. Similarly, the activities utilized in individual classes emphasized language code rather than communicative processes. On the other hand, teachers who considered grammar and accuracy to be less important focused more on communicative activities.

In each of the examples provided the practices of teachers were strongly linked to beliefs that were very broad in nature (i.e. process versus product oriented instruction and curriculum versus student based instruction). The influence of more specific beliefs was not measured. Moreover, the studies portrayed beliefs as rigid, stable structures that are difficult to alter. This perspective is supported in the general literature on teachers' beliefs. Kagan (1992a) suggested that beliefs established during the formative years of education are extremely resilient to change unless dictated by empirical evidence from one's own experiences. Pajares (1992) concurred with this finding: "Belief change during adulthood is a relatively rare phenomenon . . . Individuals tend to hold on to beliefs based on incorrect or incomplete knowledge, even after scientifically correct explanations are presented to them" (p.325). One of the factors promoting the resiliency of beliefs is their role in filtering new information that is processed (Richardson, 1996). This would suggest that early established beliefs would have a significant effect on teachers' knowledge base and their instructional decisions, in particular during the early portions of their careers.

Richards (1998) cautioned that many of the studies that report a close link between teachers' beliefs and their instructional practices are conducted in settings in which teachers were relatively free to put their beliefs into practice. In such studies contextual factors were nullified. However, in most teaching settings contextual factors play a mitigating role in autonomous teacher decision-making (Mackenzie, 2007). Calderhead (1984) noted that physical and ideological constraints influence teacher decision-making. Among the more influential factors listed were the size of class, availability of resources and the guidelines of the syllabus. Richards and Pennington

(1998) noted that cultural pressures to conform to the norms of a given context limit the options available to teachers. In their study novice teachers abandoned the principles derived during pre-service teaching under pressure from local traditions to cover prescribed material and maintain an authoritative relationship with students. In a study of eight reading teachers, Duffy and Anderson (1986) found that only four of the teachers consistently applied practices coherent with their beliefs. Among the factors cited to explain the lack of consistency were the curriculum, lack of suitable resources and students' ability levels.

An additional factor that is prevalent in the literature is student expectations. Borg (1999) investigated the use of grammatical terminology by second language teachers. He found that teachers who expressed distaste for explicit grammar instruction and the use of grammatical terminology, nonetheless, utilized it in their classes when they felt student expectations called for it. These teachers believed that failure to meet students' expectations based on their previous experiences and attitudes would adversely influence learning in the classroom. The influence of students on instructional practices was found to be significant for both experienced teachers (Borg, 1998; Borg 2003) and novice teachers with limited classroom experience (Macrory, 2000).

Contextual factors have also been found to influence the process of mediating differences between beliefs and teaching practices. Tabachnick and Zeichner (1986) analyzed the development of two novice teachers. Both teachers experienced dissonance between their ideal conceptions of how to teach and their actual teaching practices at the beginning of their careers. Nonetheless, the teachers responded very differently to the dissonance. The first teacher gradually altered her practices to become consistent with her beliefs, while the second teacher adjusted her beliefs to justify her practices. Analysis of the data revealed significant differences in the contexts in which the teachers worked. The first teacher worked in an individualistic school that afforded teachers a significant degree of autonomy. In contrast, the second teacher worked in a school that promoted close collaboration between teachers. In such a context changing her practices to be cohesive with her beliefs would have placed her at odds with her colleagues. Such an act would have risked antagonizing her colleagues and placing her in a tenuous position.

While contextual factors are influential in shaping teachers' instructional practices, an overriding theme in the literature on teacher decision-making is that teachers make decisions based on a 'practicality ethic' (Fullan, 1991). The practicality of a particular decision is based on the evidence of need, the benefits of an action, and the ease of implementation. Teachers thus make the decision to employ a particular strategy when they are convinced of its viability (Tochon & Gwyn-Paquette, 2003) and have a personal sense that it will work (Richardson, 1990; Prabhu, 1990). For many teachers practicality relates to sustaining control (Bullough, 1989; Weber & Mitchell, 1996; Gallego, 2001) or maintaining the flow of a lesson (Johnson, 1992a). For pre-service teachers practicality also involves successfully acquiring credentials by appeasing the individuals evaluating them. Tochon and Gwyn-Paquette (2003) noted that student teachers often avoid risk by mirroring the techniques of practicing teachers. They explained that the adoption of novel practices carries with it an implicit criticism of practicing teachers that may damage the relationship between student teachers and their mentors.

Wilhelm (1997) further explained that traditional practices are often followed by novice teachers in order to reduce the anxiety associated with translating theory into practice. This also has the effect of placating students who may be uncomfortable with instructional strategies that require them to move outside of their comfort zone. The author wrote: "Departure from the expected traditional classroom may result in learner stress and, possibly, negative repercussions for the teacher" (Wilhelm, 1997, p.539). The result is that much of the training received at teacher education institutes does not influence pre-service teachers' classroom decisions (Marland, 1995; Almarza, 1996). Even when decisions do appear to be directly related to the training that was received, this is often a manifestation of what Johnson (1994) called 'strategic compliance', the use of a prescribed format for display purposes until the appropriate time when adaptations may be made (Edwards, 1996).

In analyzing the decisions made in the classroom it is important to differentiate between preactive and interactive decisions (Jackson, 1968). Preactive decisions are made prior to instructional episodes when teachers have time to engage in reflection and analysis. Interactive decisions are made during the course of a lesson when a teacher must draw upon intuitive or routine practices. In making interactive decisions experienced teachers can draw upon a wealth of knowledge about students, classroom activities, and potential problems through elaborate, easily accessible cognitive schemata (Livingston & Borko, 1989). In contrast, novice teachers have more fragmented schemata that are more difficult to access due to limited exposure to similar situations. This limits the options available to them in making interactive decisions. The anxiety caused by the uncertainty of the situation and the accessibility of more well elaborated schemata based on previous experiences often causes novice teachers to revert to traditional practices that are familiar (Bailey et al., 1996).

Teacher decision-making is also strongly influenced by personal characteristics. Some individuals possess a high tolerance for uncertainty and are comfortable with the potential outcomes of taking risks. These individuals often are confident about their teaching abilities and understand that short-term failure may be required to promote long- term improvement. These are the individuals who Markee (1997b) labeled 'innovators' and 'early adopters.' In contrast, other individuals are more cautious and are unlikely to take risks or change their practices without substantial support. Sercu and St. John (2007) also identified open-mindedness as an important characteristic that determines actions. Open-minded individuals recognize that alternative beliefs exist and that their own conceptions may be erroneous and need revision. Individuals who are predisposed to challenge their convictions and assumptions are more likely to engage in the difficult process of identifying and acting upon alternative practices in the classroom. Personal characteristics thus explain why various adoption rates of innovations are found in similar settings.

The Time Frame of Change

The literature on educational change reveals that the process of transformation is gradual and non-linear. From the field of psychology Williams (cited in Mackenzie, 2007) has created a transition cycle to explain how individuals respond to changes in their lives. The cycle demonstrates that accommodation of change follows a U-shape pattern that requires a minimum of eight months. In other words, innovators require at least eight months just to become comfortable with an innovation, let alone making it a core part of their practices. This means that haphazard reform based on a tight timeline is unlikely to result in fruitful changes. Further complicating the situation is the fact that many innovations are discarded after a period of time when teachers return to more familiar practices (Van Eekelen et al., 2006). This highlights that the process of change is very complex and messy. Based on his experiences working on large-scale reform programs, Adey (2004) concluded: "Change is slow, uncertain, and has many backward steps as well as forward ones" (p.16). The process and product of change are almost impossible to plan in advance of the change. Therefore, Fullan (2001) noted: "Complexities can be unlocked and even understood but rarely controlled" (p.46).

Summary

Task-based language teaching has not been widely implemented in second language classrooms. Various reasons have been postulated based on data collected from practicing teachers. These factors can be framed according to the literature on the diffusion of innovation. This body of literature explicates the likelihood that innovation will be adopted based on a variety of categories. Among the important factors affecting implementation outlined in this chapter are the model and strategies used to introduce the innovation and the time frame provided for innovation.

The context of any innovation is another crucial factor in determining if change will be enacted. When innovation is promoted in a teacher education program, the context of innovation is strongly influenced by the structure of the program. Structures that inhibit a truly collaborative relationship between schools and the university, theory and practice undermine opportunities for student teachers to experiment. The chances of innovation are further weakened when the form of school culture is more individualistic, preventing substantive collegial collaboration in the effort to promote change.

Context is also an important factor in determining the instructional decisions of pre-service teachers. Other factors identified in the literature include the beliefs of the teacher, the personal characteristics of the teacher, and the experience of the teacher. In general, teachers' decision-making can be measured according to a practicality ethic. Teachers will make decisions based on how it will benefit them and their students in a particular situation.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE CHANGE AGENT

The implementation of innovation is a very complex process that is influenced by diverse factors. The literature on change has demonstrated the resiliency of traditional practices (Fullan, 1991) and the ineffectiveness of many attempts to promote innovation (Rogers, 1995; Lamie, 2005). The literature on the diffusion of innovation has focused on factors affecting implementation after individuals have entered into a profession. However, pre-service teacher education also serves a role in developing educators to promote the evolution of the profession.

A Role for Teacher Education in Promoting Innovation

Pre-service teacher education programs provide a scaffold enabling individuals to make the transition in the classroom from learner to teacher. This transition period is a pivotal time when pedagogical conceptions are formed, challenged and reformed on an on-going basis. Moreover, teacher preparation is a time when individuals are able to collaboratively reflect upon pedagogy and develop professional skills without the constraints of immediate performance. The timing of teacher education and the potential it has for influencing professional development make it a powerful influence in promoting innovation.

Timing is a critical factor in implementing change. Novice teachers with limited classroom experience are unlikely to innovate as their cognitive resources are dedicated to managing unfamiliar terrain. Kwo (1994) characterized novice teachers in the following manner: "At this stage, a teacher is labeling and learning each element of a classroom task in the process of acquiring a set of context-free rules. Classroom teaching performance is rational and relatively inflexible, and requires purposeful concentration" (p. 217). As outlined in this description, novice teachers must address the task of teaching in a very deliberate manner that consumes their cognitive resources. The act of learning to teach involves continual trial and error leading to the establishment of procedural knowledge. However, the type of trial and error that is attempted is unlikely to involve innovative approaches as such an act would further tax novice teachers' already limited resources. At the same time, research has demonstrated that teachers' practical knowledge becomes stabilized over time (Beijaard & Verloop, 1996). As practical knowledge becomes more entrenched in a teachers' cognition, the likelihood of adopting novel practices decreases.

This would suggest that teacher education programs can serve two important roles. First, pre-service education courses can introduce students to novel approaches, thus planting the seed for future utilization. Even if novice teachers do not initially utilize novel approaches due to contextual constraints, the introduction of various options will promote awareness that may influence later practices. Moreover, training in the form of skill development is an important component of utilizing any innovation (Hayes, 1995; Lamie, 2005). If teachers lack the skills to implement a particular approach, it will either be abandoned or altered in a manner that may compromise its efficacy. Therefore, teacher education programs can make pre-service educators aware of various options and develop the skills needed to draw on a particular approach when the setting is more appropriate.

Second, teacher education programs can assist students in developing the capacity for dealing with change (Karavas-Doukas, 1998) and the tools to promote continued professional development (Bailey et al., 1996). Continual innovation is a characteristic of most education systems. New strategies, programs and curricula are constantly being introduced for teachers to implement in their classes. Fullan (2001) contended that changes are promoted at such a rate that it would be humanly impossible to adopt all of them. However, innovation is not synonymous with improvement. Fullan (1991) wrote: "One might say that since the soundness of many innovations is questionable, it is fortunate that there is little implementation in such cases" (p.20). Therefore, teachers need to develop critical analytic skills to be able to identify innovations that will enhance the learning in their classrooms and to adapt innovations that are not appropriate. Karavas-Doukas (1998) wrote:

> The training of teachers for each and every innovation that comes their way will only serve to strengthen the 'oh no, not again' feeling and reinforce and justify their resistance to externally imposed change. Teacher education must ultimately aim to develop teachers' capacities to deal with change, so that they actively seek to experiment and improve their teaching practices and their students' learning. (p.50)

The goal of teacher education, therefore, should be to promote the beginnings of professional investigation rather than the creation of a finished product in the form of particular teaching knowledge and skills.

The ability to deal with change and promote continual professional development has been characterized in the literature in slightly different forms. Richards (1991) advocated developing a research perspective on classrooms. This would entail teachers collecting data from educational episodes, critically reflecting on teaching practices, and generating theories. Edwards (1996) called for teachers to become explorers of the teaching and learning process. This involves an experience-driven approach to teacher preparation in which reflections on teaching experiences and the observations of colleagues would play a prominent role in the process of professional development.

Lord (cited in Wilson and Berne, 1999) advocated a form of critical collegiality. Critical collegiality involves working collaboratively with peers to ensure that stagnation is avoided. This would occur by sustaining disequilibrium through constant personal reflection and collegial critique, promoting comfort with ambiguity, honing skills to resolve competing interests, and embracing an openness to new ideas. Kirk and MacDonald (2001) advanced the notion of teacher empowerment through professional partnerships. They viewed the distinction between top-down and bottom-up change as being counterproductive and, therefore, advocated partnerships among various stakeholders in the profession to review practices on an on-going basis. The continual reflection, analysis, and reformulation of practices inherent in each of these conceptualizations of professional development could be introduced in teacher education programs. In addition to introducing pre-service teachers' to the models, they could also develop their skills to productively participate in the process of analyzing and refining their practices. This would serve to avoid the type of fossilization in teaching practices mentioned by Beijaard and Verloop (1996) and make teachers more amenable to innovation when it appropriately suits their teaching context.

In order to understand the impact that teacher education can have in the process of promoting innovation, it is first important to analyze recent trends in teacher education that have shaped current practices.

Trends in Teacher Education

The literature on teacher education has demonstrated a significant shift in how teachers are perceived. Prior to the 1970s pre-service teachers were portrayed as *tabula rasa* on which teacher educators would script their expertise in educational processes.

Adopting the perspective that student teachers were empty conduits to be filled, the previous knowledge and experiences of individuals and their unique essence as human beings were deemed irrelevant. Teacher educators were simply responsible for preparing student teachers to utilize behaviours that were identified as being crucial elements of effective teaching. Based on this viewpoint, research conducted by teacher educators focused on identifying teaching behaviours that would positively contribute to learning (Dunkin & Biddle, 1974). The process-product research that was produced advocated generic teaching behaviours such as effective questioning strategies (Barnett & Smith, 1992), the use of particular forms of feedback (Berliner, 1985), and wait-time between posing a question and identifying a respondent (Rowe, 1974). According to Richards (1987), this promoted a view of teaching as a kind of technology that could be utilized regardless of the context or whether the source of its efficacy was well understood. Such a view of teaching was further promoted in the field of second language education by emphasizing the development of skills to utilize particular instructional methods rather than to establish an individualized approach (Richards & Rodgers, 2001).

Dissatisfaction with the narrow view of teaching advocated by process-product research, prompted researchers to adopt an alternative agenda. In the mid 1970s research emerged that analyzed teachers' thoughts in influencing their practices. The main focus of this teacher cognition research was in identifying the thought processes of effective teachers. Researchers believed that such knowledge could then be used to train novice teachers to think like their more experienced counterparts. Clark and Peterson (1986) summarized the focus of this research agenda: "We should focus our experimental research . . . on training [pre-service] teachers to perceive, analyze, and transform their perceptions of the classroom in ways similar to those used by effective teachers" (p.281). This research posited teachers as thoughtful individuals who made rational decisions about classroom interactions (Freeman & Johnson, 1998). Nonetheless, the experiences of individual teachers and how they came to understand the education process were not deemed as important as the generic, cognitive processes that were utilized by teachers, whose students scored high on administered tests.

Subsequently, teacher educators began to recognize the complexity of educational episodes and the varying influences on teachers' instructional decision-making. Teachers began to be acknowledged as individuals who interpret and construct classroom interactions based on their previous experiences as a learner (Lortie, 1975), personal practical knowledge (Clandinin, 1986; Golombek, 1998), beliefs (Pajares, 1992; Williams & Burden, 1997; Peacock, 2001; Richardson, 2003), images (Bullough, 1994; Weber & Mitchell, 1996; Hawkey, 1996) and conceptions of second language education (Freeman & Richards, 1993). In contrast to earlier conceptions of the teacher advocated in the literature, this new perspective portrayed teachers as active agents in their professional development who are strongly influenced by contextual factors. According to this perspective, teacher education is not an exercise in training prospective teachers to demonstrate particular behaviours or think in a particular manner, but rather a process in assisting teachers to make principled pedagogical decisions.

The Traditional 'Tell, Show, Guide' Approach to Teacher Education

Despite significant changes in how teachers have been portrayed in the literature, teacher education programs continue to be strongly influenced by tradition (Freeman, 1996). According to Myers (2002), the most widely practiced approach to teacher education stresses telling, showing and a component of guided practice. In most programs 'telling', in the form of lecturing students, consumes the vast majority of time spent in university classrooms with the other components addressed through occasional microteaching activities or practical field experiences. This approach to teacher education is premised on the notion that learning to teach is a static, stabile process and that the knowledge required by a teacher can be neatly packaged and presented to students by an expert within the field. These assumptions not only contradict current theoretical conceptions of teacher education (Johnson, 2006) but also widely supported theories of learning. Constructivist scholars have demonstrated the importance of previously established mental schemata on the development of new knowledge (von Glasersfeld, 2005). From a constructivist perspective, knowledge is not acquired in a linear fashion from an external entity. On the contrary, learning is a complex, organic process that is promoted through repeated opportunities to interact and negotiate with new information. Fosnot (2005b) wrote: "From a constructivist perspective, meaning is understood to be the result of humans setting up relationships, reflecting on their actions, and modeling and constructing explanations" (p.280). Therefore, ideas cannot simply be shared, they must be individually constructed.

The continued reliance of teacher educators on this antiquated model of instruction has serious implications for the development of second language pedagogy and the introduction of innovations. Socio-culturally based research has demonstrated that teachers' understanding about educational processes is highly influenced by their early experiences as a learner – what Lortie (1975) labeled the 'apprenticeship of observation.' During these formative years in the classroom, individuals develop philosophies about the teaching-learning process that become deeply rooted in their belief systems (Richardson, 1996) and create mental schemata through which new information is interpreted (Kagan, 1992a). Research has demonstrated that early-established beliefs about education are difficult to change, in particular during pre-service training if they are only covertly challenged through exposure to contradictory evidence (Richardson, 2003). Richardson (1997) wrote:

> The traditional approach to teaching – the transmission model – promotes neither the interaction between prior and new knowledge nor the conversations that are necessary for internalization and deep understanding. The information acquired from traditional teaching, if acquired at all, is usually not well integrated with other knowledge held by students. Thus, new knowledge is often only brought forth for school like activities such as exams, and ignored at all other times. (p.3)

Therefore, new information presented to students through the 'tell, show, guide' approach often does not have a major influence on re-structuring individual's cognitive schemata. The result is that the tacit understandings that shape teachers' work are left unchallenged.

From a cognitive perspective, Winitzky and Kauchuk (1997) further elaborated on the difficulties associated with traditional approaches to teacher education. They argued that the knowledge pre-service teachers bring with them when they enter into the teaching profession is often not well integrated or coherently structured. On the contrary, the authors asserted that learners often utilize fragmentary pieces of knowledge known as phenomenological primitives (p-prims). P-prims are not erroneous beliefs but rather unorganized abstractions "that have not been subjected to instruction, analysis, and reflection and that are applied inappropriately in the absence of principled knowledge" (Winitzky & Kauchuk, 1997, p.73). In other words, p-prims are abstractions that are based on particular episodes but have not been well integrated into an individual's schemata. Therefore, p-prims do not need to be eliminated but rather restructured as part of the cognitive framework. However, traditional approaches that are based on the provision of pre-determined content fail to address the episodic knowledge that p-prims are based on. This results in the continued reliance of teachers on unprincipled knowledge as a source of action.

Constructivist Approach to Teacher Education

Winitzky and Kauchuk (1997) proposed a constructivist approach to teacher education to promote the reorganization of students' cognitive schemata. They advocated a program that would promote the clarification and use of p-prims to help pre-service teachers make sense of teaching. In this way personal experiences would act as the starting point for investigating educational practices. This would shift the focus of instruction from the presentation of content deemed relevant by the instructor to the analysis and construction of knowledge pertinent to students.

The use of students' knowledge and experiences as the starting point in teacher education has been advocated by numerous authors in the literature. Edwards (1996) advocated the use of students' knowledge about classrooms and language learning as the impetus to promote the meaningful analysis of classroom episodes. Other authors have stressed the importance of tacit understandings in shaping teachers' practices.

Hasweh (2003), for example, argued that awareness is a central component of promoting professional development. Therefore, teacher education programs need to provide opportunities for student teachers to bring their tacit beliefs to the level of consciousness (Clark, 1988; Kagan, 1992a; Cheng, 2002; Hasweh, 2003; Richardson, 2003). This may be accomplished through the analysis of one's autobiography (Bailey et al., 1996), completion of reflective journals (Loughran, 2006), class discussions (Edwards, 1996) or dialogue and debate (Tillema, 2004). In making one's beliefs and assumptions transparent, they become available to scrutiny. Gallego (2001) explained that this is important in revealing unexamined attitudes that adversely influence teaching practices. Patterson (2002) further stated that the explicit statement and analysis of teaching beliefs and practices was a powerful strategy in promoting lasting change through reculturing. This would occur by creating dissatisfaction with current conceptions and creating a frame through which to make new conceptions more intelligible (Hewson & Hewson, 1989).

The aforementioned structure of promoting conceptual change has been labeled by Tillema (2004) as an 'embedding orientation.' In this approach student teachers beliefs are the starting point through which new information is filtered, promoting an incremental process of belief change. Tillema (2004) described this approach in the following manner:

> Using lay theories or (student) teachers' initial beliefs as a starting point for explicating the implicit know-how contained in them while a the same time gradually insert and link new prevalent and adjacent knowledge on teaching to the knowledge base of the student; thus preparing and scaffolding teacher learning with "adequate" reflective conceptions before engaging in the immediacy and pressures of classroom teaching. (p.143)

This approach is contrasted with what Tillema labeled an 'immersion orientation.' Within this orientation, practical experiences are viewed as the stimulus to promote conceptual change. Tillema (2004) explained: "In an immersion strategy, beliefs are dealt with in a 'local', i.e., contextual and implicit way, letting practice experiences have a decisive and confrontational effect upon the student teacher's rebuilding and personal construction of a professional knowledge base" (p.152). Thus, an immersion orientation would require practical experiences to occur prior to engaging in the reflective process.

Although Tillema (2004) identified pros and cons to each of the approaches, his investigation of the effect of each strategy on the development of student teachers demonstrated that a combined approach would be optimal. The researcher found that practical experiences had a reducing effect on initial positive beliefs, while reflective periods promoted an increase in positive beliefs. He also concluded that beliefs established through reflection were less stable and more vulnerable to change than beliefs established as a result of practical experiences. This led to the conclusion that a combination of embedding and immersion strategies would be most beneficial in promoting meaningful change.

Despite abundant theoretical support for a teacher education program that promotes the analysis of students' experiences and beliefs as the impetus for professional learning, few empirical studies have been conducted to identify the impact of such a program on teachers. Tsang (2004) conducted an investigation into the effects of pre-service teachers' personal practical knowledge on their interactive decision-making. He concluded that the explicit expression of one's personal practical knowledge assisted in automatizing teachers' instructional decisions. Tsang (2004) wrote: "Bringing personal practical knowledge to the foreground helps optimize the accessibility to, or potential application of, such knowledge in the decision-making process" (p.195). The study focused on the experiences of pre-service teachers during their practical field experiences though and did not demonstrate the effectiveness of a constructivist approach applied during course work.

McDiarmid (1990) investigated the effect of a course project on students' conceptions about math education. In order to challenge students' long held assumptions, she utilized a field experience in which students observed an experienced teacher teaching in a non-traditional manner. The observation was used as the impetus for several discussions and writing activities in which students' assumptions about math education would be challenged. She concluded that the course had a nominal effect on students' beliefs; however, the author did not collect formal data but rather made inferences based on students' work and dialogues from the classroom.

Several authors have also attempted to use constructivist-informed approaches to teach student teachers about constructivism. Mayer-Smith and Mitchell (1997) developed a course to challenge students' ideas about science education. The authors attempted to promote a constructivist perspective on education by interweaving the concept with other course objectives throughout the semester. This was accomplished by conducting mini-lessons for the students to participate in, holding regular debriefing sessions to promote critical dialogue, and mandating the use of a reflective journal to promote deep reflection about science education. The authors concluded that the structure of the course was successful in promoting the use of constructivist-oriented approaches in eleven of the sixteen students participating in the study.

Fosnot (2005a) also attempted to promote a constructivist disposition among pre-service elementary teachers at the Center for Constructivist Teaching/Teacher Preparation Project. The program was based on starting with students' traditional views of education and challenging them through a series of activities, periods of reflection and dialogue during course work and field experiences. Course work and field experiences were interspersed, ensuring that theoretical discussions were grounded in concrete experiences. Moreover, a mentor program was established to assist teachers in continuing to implement approaches learned during the project. The project proved to be very successful in promoting constructivist teaching practices and in preparing graduates to act as change agents within their schools.

The aforementioned studies enjoyed mixed results in attempting to promote change using embedding and immersion strategies. Of the programs listed, only Fosnot (2005a) promoted the analysis of tacit conceptions of education as the foundation of instruction. The other authors promoted reflection on the underlying assumptions that shape students' conceptions of teaching; however, these were utilized as a side activity rather than the focus of the course. Moreover, Fosnot (2005a) was the only study in which an innovation-based perspective was adopted. The study was set in a unique context though, which differs significantly from typical teacher education programs. This undermines the value of the study to most educational settings.

Summary

Teacher education programs have been largely neglected in the diffusion of innovation literature. Nonetheless, they offer great potential for influencing the capacity of professionals to undertake continuous professional development and accommodate innovation. In order for teacher education programs to adopt a more influential role, it is important that the structure of courses is carefully analyzed and refined. The literature on teacher education generally supports the use of a constructivist-based approach that promotes the use of students' beliefs, knowledge and experiences as the foundation for learning. Nonetheless, few empirical studies have been undertaken to assess the efficacy of an embedding strategy in promoting professional development and the diffusion of innovation, in particular in a second language classroom.

CHAPTER FIVE: METHODOLOGY

Approach

The intent of this research project was to develop a rich description of the development of second language pre-service teachers as they were exposed for the first time to a curriculum course and practical field experience. The questions that the study addressed are: 1) How does a constructivist based approach to teacher education influence student teachers' professional development? 2) What influence does the course have on pre-service teachers' disposition towards, and utilization of, task-based language teaching? 3) What factors influence student teachers' instructional decisions during their five-week practicum? To this end, a case study approach was selected. Creswell (1998) defined a case study as "an exploration of a 'bounded system' or a case (or multiple cases) over time through detailed, in-depth data collection involving multiple sources of information rich in context" (p.61). The case is a bounded system in that it captures particular events and individuals grounded in a specific time and space. In the context of this research project, the boundaries of the case were clearly delineated according to the duration of one semester and the participation of students enrolled in particular second language curriculum courses. The bounded nature of the study facilitated the identification of critical influences on pre-service teachers' initial professional development. It also enabled the researcher to evaluate the effectiveness of an inquiry-based approach to instruction on student teachers' conceptions and utilization of theoretically supported approaches to instruction.

Although the experiences of individual students were the focus of the study, these experiences were tied to a particular context of equal importance to the research objectives. Therefore, the researcher was not interested in the intrinsic value of an individual case but rather the phenomenon of establishing an early philosophy of teaching and learning in a second language classroom based on experiences in an inquiry-based course and a five-week practicum. To investigate and establish a deep understanding of this phenomenon, a collective case study approach was utilized (Stake, 2000). The collective case study approach has the benefit of providing multiple points of reference from which to understand a particular phenomenon. This allows for cross case comparisons and the identification of commonalities in students' experiences. The collective case study has the further benefit of allowing for a broader understanding of the phenomenon and the establishment of fuzzy propositions (Bassey, 1999) to inform educational practices. This does not mean that the experiences outlined in the cases are generalizable. On the contrary, as with any form of qualitative investigation, the results are only indicative of the experiences of unique individuals in unique contexts. They cannot be assumed to be universally applicable nor replicable. Nonetheless, they provide insights that contribute to our ability to theorize particular events and inform our practices. Merriam (2001) wrote: "It [case study] offers insights and illuminates meanings that expand its readers' experiences. These insights can be constructed as tentative hypotheses that help structure future research; hence, case study plays an important role in advancing a field's knowledge base" (p.199).

The breadth established through the use of a collective case study is not without consequence. According to Johnson and Christensen (2000) depth of analysis is sacrificed when multiple cases are incorporated into a study. In the current study this trade off was deemed desirable, as the unique experiences of individual student teachers were less informative of the process of preparing to become a second language educator in isolation than they were in conjunction with additional voices.

Research Site

The research for this study was conducted in the Faculty of Education at the University of Alberta. The faculty has an annual enrolment of over three thousand students and offers a range of programs to pre-service teachers wishing to specialize in a variety of areas. Undergraduate students in the department must complete numerous subject specific and professional courses and participate in field experiences of five weeks and nine weeks in length. This site was selected for its convenience in collecting data and its appropriateness for addressing the research questions identified in the study. The researcher was regularly assigned to teach third year curriculum courses for students minoring in second language. This enabled the researcher to control the structure of the courses and to align the content to more closely link theoretical concepts with practical applications. This was critical to analyzing the effectiveness of a dialogic, inquiry-based approach in addressing the theory-practice divide in second language pedagogy.

Finally, the structure of the program at the University of Alberta was ideal for investigating the influence of curriculum courses and field experiences on pre-service teachers' conceptions of teaching a second language. Within the teacher education program, students are not exposed to curriculum courses or practical experiences until their third year in the faculty. Therefore, students enrolled in initial curriculum courses can provide valuable insight for investigating the influence of the apprenticeship of observation and initial exposure to theories of second language acquisition and experiences in a classroom setting.

Participants

Participants for the study were elicited from third year curriculum courses that prepare students for teaching in a second language setting. Twelve students volunteered to take part in the research project. Data from all twelve students was utilized to assess the effect of the course on students' disposition towards the innovation. Nonetheless, only five were selected to be utilized as part of the multi-case study. The size of the sample was selected to afford a varied portrayal of the experiences of student teachers enrolled in the program. Although the primary objective of the study was to present rich descriptions of the professional development undertaken by pre-service teachers, the use of multiple case studies also facilitated the identification of commonalities in the experiences of the participants.

Selection of research participants was primarily based on the amount of teaching completed during the five-week practicum in the students' minor. One student was eliminated from the study due to difficulties in comprehending questions posed during the interview. The remainder of the research sample was selected based on the amount of time spent teaching a second language in a classroom setting. Student teachers who did not have any experience teaching their minor or who served primarily as 'teaching assistants' or 'tutors' – assisting with the delivery of instruction rather than assuming principal responsibilities for classroom activities - were not included in the study, as their practical experiences were deemed to be too limited to have a significant effect on their development as an educator.

Data Collection and Analysis

The creation of detailed cases was facilitated by the use of quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative data was collected using a pedagogical beliefs scale (see Appendix A). The pedagogical beliefs scale was inspired by the instrument used in Karavas-Doukas (1996) to investigate Greek teachers' attitudes towards the communicative approach. Similar to the instrument used by Karavas-Doukas, the pedagogical beliefs scale utilized a five-point Likert scale. A five-point scale was selected to account for uncertainties that may occur because of pre-service teachers' lack of exposure to specific elements of second language pedagogy, in particular at the beginning of the curriculum course. The Likert scale format was selected for its ease of use by respondents and the simplicity afforded the researcher in interpreting the data without the need for judgement claims to be made.

The pedagogical beliefs scale comprised twenty-six statements relating to thirteen topics. Student teachers were asked to assess their level of agreement with each of these statements. The topics presented in the instrument included: the role of the teacher, error correction, explicit grammar instruction, group work, student versus teacher-directed instruction, learner input, use of exercises/drills, language use versus language study, syllabus design, fluency versus accuracy, the role of culture in the classroom, focus on product versus process, and the importance of promoting autonomy. Each topic was represented in the scale with a positively phrased statement and a negatively phrased statement. For example, the negative statement relating to error correction stated: "Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits." In contrast the positive statement read, "Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore large amounts of correction are a waste of time." This allowed for the split-half method to be used to assess the inner reliability of each of the statement pairs (see Appendix B for a breakdown of the reliability score for each statement pair). According to Oppenheim (1992), most Likert scales achieve a reliability of 0.85. This coefficient was adopted as the target for achieving an acceptable level of scale reliability. However, the reliability rating for the pedagogical beliefs scale was 0.83. As this was below the desired level, the decision was made to eliminate the statement pairs that were least reliable. Statement pairs that scored below 0.70 (the pairs relating to the role of the teacher and teacher versus student-directed instruction) were eliminated from the scale, resulting in an overall reliability rating of 0.87 for the remaining 11 statement pairs. This exceeds the standard set by Oppenheim and, therefore, the conclusion can be drawn that the scale had a high level of internal consistency.

The results from the pedagogical beliefs scale were used to determine student teachers' disposition towards the use of task-based language teaching. 'Disposition' has been defined in numerous manners in the professional literature. Murrell Jr. and Foster (2003) defined 'disposition' as "enactment of one's beliefs or one's attitudes" (p.47). This definition assumes that one is disposed to something only if action is linked to a particular belief or attitude. This ignores the fact that one may be inclined to act in a particular manner but not do so due to numerous external factors. Therefore, a definition of 'disposition' will be adopted in this paper that is more coherent with its denotative meaning of a 'tendency towards something', which is not linked to an actual behaviour. Disposition will thus be referred to as "teacher affect – attitudes, values and beliefs that influence the application and use of knowledge and skills" (Wilkerson & Lang, 2007, p.2). In other words, the scale will measure students' penchant towards using TBLT, without making claims about their actual usage of the approach. The TBLT Disposition Scale (TDS) was established by taking statement pairs from the pedagogical beliefs scale and ascribing numerical values to them. For positively phrased statements that demonstrated coherence with the principles of TBLT, a statement of 'strongly disagree' was ascribed a score of one. For example, the statement 'tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher' demonstrates a strong disposition towards the use of task-based language teaching in the classroom. Therefore, a response of 'strongly disagree' resulted in the student receiving one point on the TBLT Disposition Scale. Similarly, 'disagree' was scored as two, 'neutral/uncertain' was equal to three, 'agree' was given four points, and 'strongly agree' scored as five. For negative statements that demonstrated a lack of coherence with TBLT, the inverse scoring system was used.

To promote scale validity not all statement pairs from the pedagogical beliefs scale were utilized in creating the TBLT Disposition Scale. The two statement pairs that were deemed unreliable based on their low consistency ratings were not included due to the negative effects they would have on the numerical results. Moreover, the statement pair relating to culture in the language classroom was also not included in the disposition scale, as culture was not deemed to be a critical component of TBLT that differentiated it from other more didactic approaches. The end result was the creation of a scale that ranged from 20 (very low disposition towards using TBLT) to 100 (very high disposition).

In addition to the quantitative data collected from the two scales, qualitative data was collected using multiple methods. First, students were provided with three lesson descriptions and asked to analyze them (see Appendix C). Students were guided in the analysis with a series of questions prompting them to critique the effectiveness of the lesson in motivating students, promoting language acquisition and limiting the strain on language teachers. Each of the lesson descriptions utilized a different instructional model: PPP, TBLT, and ESA. PPP and TBLT have been defined in chapter one. ESA is a model developed by Harmer (1998) that includes three components – engage, study and activate. In the 'engage' stage of the model students are introduced to the topic of the lesson and encouraged to develop an interest in subsequent activities. In the 'study' stage learners engage in a variety of activities that focus their attention on the structure of language, while in the 'activate' stage learners use language with a primary focus on expressing meaning. Harmer (1998) developed a number of sequences for utilizing the three components, including the straight arrow sequence (ESA), the boomerang sequence (EASA), and the patchwork sequence (any other combination). The lesson used in the lesson analysis assignment followed a patchwork sequence.

The various instructional models included in the lesson analyses were used to assess students' sense of plausibility (Prabhu, 1990) towards each model. Plausibility relates to a teacher's sense of what will promote positive learning experiences for students. The lessons were further structured to gauge students' perceptions towards critical elements of a second language classroom such as immediate error correction, the use of authentic materials, culture and second language learning, and the inclusion of stimulating, relevant content. Finally, at the conclusion of the assignment students were asked to select the lesson that they would prefer to teach and to describe the reasons for their selection.

Second, students were asked to analyze their experiences as a second language learner (see Appendix D). The apprenticeship of observation is deemed to have a significant effect on pre-service teachers' conceptions of second language education (Johnson, 1999), therefore, the analysis of their experiences as a language learner was considered to provide baseline information on their fledgling educational philosophies. The first part of the activity involved a description of the learning activities that they were commonly involved in as language learners. Most students had diverse experiences in learning a second language; however, they were prompted to describe the experiences that best characterized how they were instructed. Subsequently, they were asked to evaluate the general instruction they received and to describe their favourite lesson as a language learner.

Third, data was collected using concept maps and an accompanying written explanation to describe students' philosophy of second language teaching and learning. Novak and Gowan (1984) wrote that "concept maps are intended to represent meaningful relationships between concepts" (p.15). Traditional concept maps are typically created by placing words or concepts in ovular shapes connected by lines. However, alternative forms of concept maps were also welcomed, as long as the individual's philosophy was revealed in a graphic manner. Students were instructed to develop comprehensive concept maps that would account for the complexity of the educational process in a second language classroom. Thus, the concept maps provided a layered description of students' educational philosophies drawing on various components of second language pedagogy.

Fourth, student teachers were asked to reflect upon the evolution of their philosophy of education during the semester. Students were instructed to utilize assignments completed at the beginning of the semester to provide a baseline from which changes in their philosophy could be gauged. Significant changes were often the result of specific events, which students were asked to elaborate upon.

Fifth, participants were asked to analyze five lesson plans that were used during the five-week practicum. The analysis consisted of explaining the rationale for activities and describing the perceived effectiveness of the lessons in promoting a productive learning environment. Inconsistencies in the rationale and approach adopted were used by the researcher to probe for further clarification. The lesson analyses challenged the student teachers to reveal their pedagogical systems and identify the factors that influenced their instructional decisions.

Finally, data was collected through individual interviews with research participants (see Appendix E). Interviews were conducted in an informal, semi-structured conversational manner. This approach was utilized to create a relaxed environment in which participants were more likely to reveal how their pedagogical systems were formed and how this contributed to their instructional practices. Interviews ranged in length; however, the average length of interview was approximately ninety minutes. Interviews were digitally recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Data was collected at three critical junctures during the semester: at the beginning of the curriculum course, at the conclusion of the course, and at the conclusion of the five-week practicum. The trustworthiness of data was promoted by adhering to Denzin's (2001) suggestion for 'sophisticated rigor' to reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation. For qualitative researchers this involves promoting the triangulation of data. Creswell (2005) defined triangulation in the following manner: "triangulation is the process of corroborating evidence from different individuals (e.g., a principal and a student), types of data (e.g., observational fieldnotes and interviews), or methods of data collection (e.g., documents and interviews) in descriptions and themes in qualitative research" (p.252). Although different individuals were not used in interpreting the data, triangulation was accomplished through the various types of data and methods of data collection used at each juncture. At the beginning of the course data was collected in the form of the pedagogical beliefs scale, the lesson analyses and the evaluation of experiences as a language learner. At the conclusion of the course data was triangulated using the pedagogical beliefs scale, the concept map assignment and the language pedagogy analysis assignment. Finally, triangulation was achieved at the end of the practicum by again drawing on the pedagogical beliefs scale in conjunction with the analysis of lessons used during the practicum and the interview. The use of multiple sources of data at each point in time assisted in promoting clarity and offered rich sources of information from which to identify the professional development experienced by pre-service teachers and to craft the case study for each student.

After all the data was collected and thoroughly read, coding categories were established to organize the material. Initially data was chronologically coded according to its influence upon students' professional development prior to the curriculum course, during the curriculum course or during the practicum. Subsequently, data was coded to identify critical elements of student teachers' philosophy of second language teaching and learning. The thirteen categories used as part of the pedagogical beliefs scale were drawn upon to identify shifts in students' perceptions. Finally, critical events that shaped the pre-service teachers' pedagogical systems and influenced their instructional practices were identified and coded. Once the data was comprehensively analyzed, narratives were established to portray the journey students undertook in the first stages of becoming a second language educator.

CHAPTER SIX: CASE STUDIES

The narratives offered provide a glimpse of reality that is several times removed from its source. Of course this is not a condemnation of the narrative or the structure of the study itself, but rather an acknowledgment of the limitations presented by such a form of inquiry. Britzman (2003) noted: "For poststructuralists, representation is always in crisis" (p.245). What has not been represented is equally as telling as what has been represented. Therefore, it is important to acknowledge that the reality represented in the narratives has been shaped and re-shaped numerous times based on the perceptual lens of the subject, interpretive bias of the narrator (Bogdan & Biklen, 2007), and constraints of the language used to convey meaning. The end product of the narratives is a conglomeration of multiple voices scratching upon a perceived reality.

As the researcher and author, my voice is prominent in each of the cases. My personal experiences and biases have influenced the questions that were asked, the data that was highlighted and the construction of the cases. Therefore, it is important to reveal my personal story before presenting the stories of the participants in the study.

I come from a well-educated family with both parents working at the university in the city where I grew up. As a result, I was exposed from a young age to an environment in which questioning norms was encouraged. In elementary school I attended a program for gifted learners. In this program learners were given a great deal of autonomy to influence the syllabus of instruction and to explore topics that were of interest. My experiences in this program were very influential in shaping my perceptions of education. They led me to believe in the value of student-directed instruction and provided a model of how alternative approaches could be successfully implemented.

As a teenager I had the opportunity to travel to Europe on two occasions and live in a German community. On the first occasion I attended school at a local gymnasium, an academically oriented high school, for three months. I was very impressed with the quality of education received by my German counterparts, in particular with the emphasis on oral academic skills, something I felt was lacking from my own education. The two experiences in Europe also made me acutely aware of the cultural biases I had developed growing up in North America. Awareness of these biases was further developed when I taught English in Ukraine for a year.

After graduating with a Bachelor of Education degree and working in a high school in Saskatchewan for three years, I moved to Ethiopia to work as a teacher educator. I conducted courses on the English language and second language methodology and supervised student teachers during their four-week practicum. I also created and facilitated professional development programs for local English teachers and teacher educators at the college where I was working. Most educators in Ethiopia relied heavily on lecturing and summative assessment in the form of exams. As a result, my primary objective with the professional development programs was to introduce teachers to the principles of active learning and formative assessment and to offer guidance in their implementation. Although considerable time, effort, and resources had been dedicated to the programs, I was skeptical about their lasting effect on the instructional practices of teachers I had worked with. This skepticism combined with a personal desire to develop the skills necessary to make more of a lasting impact, motivated me to enter into graduate studies.

Early in my program as a master's student I was acquainted with SLA research that was counter-intuitive and contradicted much of what I had believed to be effective practice in second language instruction. This caused me to question my efficacy as a teacher and to explore alternatives. One of the alternatives that seemed particularly attractive from an applied linguistics and social justice perspective was TBLT. However, the literature on TBLT presented it as a rarely used approach with limited applications in most second language classrooms. The divide between theory and practice intrigued me and presented a prime opportunity to investigate opportunities to promote change.

In sum, my experiences have led me to question the assumptions in taken-for-granted practices and to advocate experimentation with alternative approaches. I do not believe that change is synonymous with improvement; however, I do believe that there is room for improvement in what currently takes place in second language classrooms.

The Story of Annika

Annika's decision to enter into the teaching profession was shaped at a young age. She demonstrated the characteristics typically associated with teachers, prompting many of her friends and adult acquaintances to encourage her to become a teacher. She stated: "*Everyone said I would be a great teacher. So I said no way I'm going to be a teacher because I didn't want to do what everyone said I would do*." Repeated statements about her potential aptitude as a teacher planted a seed that influenced her as she matured. She explained: "*Then I finally thought, you know what I think I'd be good* *at [teaching] and I think that even if I realized I wouldn't, that teaching wasn't my thing, that a degree in education was not a bad idea.*" Armed with this belief she enrolled in the Faculty of Education.

Upon entering into the Faculty of Education Annika had to declare a major and a minor. She had always enjoyed English so it was a natural choice as her major teaching subject. However, choosing a minor was much more difficult. She had enjoyed many subjects in school but didn't have a passion for any of them. The decision to make German her minor was made based on the success she had experienced, earning 90s in the subject throughout high school. It was a decision she would quickly regret. She recalled: "*I did German 150 and I got placed in the advanced class because the exam was a written exam and I did okay . . . But the thing is I was so lost I couldn't understand the teacher. We'd watch films. I couldn't understand the films. I knew nothing, like I couldn't produce anything and I hated it. It turned me away from German completely.*" With her confidence shaken, Annika decided not to pursue German further. This left her with the quandary of choosing another minor teaching subject.

The determination about what her minor would be came to her suddenly while watching a movie one day. She explained: "*I watched 'Man on Fire' with Denzel Washington and he was speaking Spanish in it. And I thought, that's a nice language. If Denzel can speak it, I can speak it.*" Soon afterwards she enrolled in a distance education program and began to study Spanish. She really enjoyed the experience and was motivated to pursue the language as her minor teaching subject at the university. She soon realized that she not only had an aptitude for the language but a real passion as well. "*It's just bizarre but I just fell into it [learning Spanish] and I realized that maybe this is the passion thing that I was looking for, that I just couldn't find in anything else.*" Her passion for the language was further fuelled when she spent a portion of the summer studying Spanish in Peru. This prompted her to appreciate the culture of Hispanic people and the benefits of learning a second language even more. It also reinforced her decision to become a teacher so that she could share these benefits with her students. She stated: "*Spanish is so wonderful and there's so many wonderful people and you could travel and do so many things with that. . . I wanted to open people's eyes to that I guess and hopefully, maybe let even one person find what I found.*"

As might be expected based on her experiences, Annika had very negative recollections about her German classes. She recalled German class as being an unfriendly place where she felt intimidated. Although she had done well in her classes, she had felt discouraged by the lack of praise given by the teacher and the competitive atmosphere that had been promoted. Furthermore, her struggles in university German left an indelible mark about the importance of developing students' oral and written capabilities. Her inability to comprehend or speak German after several years of studying motivated her to ascribe importance to the regular use of communicative activities in the classroom.

In contrast to her experiences learning German, Annika had very favourable memories of learning Spanish at the university. Each of her Spanish courses was organized in a very similar manner. The syllabus of the courses was based on the introduction of new vocabulary and grammar at the beginning of each unit followed by numerous opportunities for repetitive practice. She wrote: "*Grammar was emphasized most, but also competent conversation*." Competent conversation was not identified as the perfect use of language though. The focus of the instructors was on making students feel comfortable so that they would participate in oral activities. Annika wrote: "*[There was] less focus on perfection and more focus on risk taking. Student errors were only corrected if repeated by one individual many times, or by several different individuals. People were less afraid to make mistakes and more willing to try*." Although a very positive, supportive environment was established within the class, Annika questioned the efficacy of the communicative activities used. She wrote: "*Class discussions prevent many people from participating (shy). [In] group discussions many [students] still use English*." Despite this criticism, she felt that oral activities were not used enough in class. She was also critical of the decontextualized manner in which vocabulary was introduced and assessed within the class. "*Vocabulary [was] tested only in terms of memorization and regurgitation – [we] needed more real life contextualized use*." This sentiment was reiterated in reference to other activities used in the class. Annika believed that the relevance of activities should be made clear to students so that it would be easier for them to apply in a real context.

The influence of her experiences as a German and Spanish learner was evident in her assessment of the lessons at the beginning of the class. She appreciated the focused nature of the PPP lesson but questioned its efficacy because she didn't believe the relevance of the topic introduced was made clear to students: "*[The lesson] focuses on a particular concept but should explain the relevance of the conditional construct. Perhaps showing [its] correspondence with [the] native language [would be* *beneficial]. . . [Students] must see its practical use.*" In contrast, she believed the ESA lesson effectively promoted the relevance of what was being learned. She noted: "*I like how the students' interest is grabbed and relates the learning of the concept to Canadian culture. This provides more meaning to the lesson and concept and especially because the students are asked to relate to their own culture will likely go into long-term memory if [the] relevance is seen and the concept can be linked to previous knowledge.*" For Annika it was essential that learning be directed towards using the language, rather than simply learning the language as a decontextualized subject.

Based on her advocacy of learning a language in order to use it, she favoured participative approaches to instruction. She liked how students in the PPP lesson were actively involved in the lesson; however, she felt additional oral exercises could be included. Similarly, she liked the discovery nature of the ESA lesson and believed that repeated opportunities to use the language during the class and in the homework assignment would effectively promote language acquisition. Nonetheless, she was apprehensive about the use of group activities in the class, as she believed this would place teachers in a tenuous position. She wrote: "*A lot of trust is placed in students. Would not necessarily work in every classroom [as] the group work may get hectic and the class unable to focus.*" Annika's apprehension towards the use of group work was not restricted to concerns over managing the behaviour in the class. She was also concerned about the efficacy of learner-centered teaching strategies. She explained: "*[The] teacher is relying on the students to discover the rules and, therefore, may have more work in the future and in the classroom with some students if they do not* *understand*." This caused her to express support for the use of drills and other techniques that enabled the teacher to control the learning process.

Annika's support for teacher-centered instruction was demonstrated in her assessment of the TBLT lesson. In analyzing the lesson she commented: *"[The] effectiveness is hard to wager. Students are not aware of what they are supposed to be learning. Where is the relevance? What are they trying to learn*?" This quote demonstrated Annika's perspective that language learning consisted of introducing and practicing particular linguistic structures. From her perspective, the TBLT lesson was not promoting language acquisition because specific forms were not being introduced by the teacher for students to use. Skepticism over the value of TBLT was further reinforced by her responses on the pedagogical beliefs scale (see Appendix F). Annika demonstrated strong support for teacher-centered activities that promoted explicit grammatical knowledge. Moreover, she revealed the belief that errors had to be immediately corrected, otherwise bad habits would be formed. This belief somewhat contradicted her experiences as a language learner and demonstrated the overwhelming importance she ascribed to the accurate usage of language. These beliefs contributed to a pre-course score of 55 on the TDS, a score that demonstrates her philosophy had little coherence with the principles of TBLT. It was somewhat ironic then that the lesson she described as her favourite from her experiences learning Spanish would best be described as a task-based lesson.

When Annika entered into the curriculum course she admitted that she had very limited knowledge about second language education. She stated: "*I didn't know anything about foreign language teaching at all. I didn't even think of functions and* *tasks and things like that.*" The course would have a transformative effect on her professional development not only because it exposed her to new elements of second language teaching but also because it would cause her to seriously evaluate and reassess her earlier beliefs about language teaching and learning. She wrote: "*At the beginning of the semester, most of my beliefs about second language teaching and learning were based solely on my own experiences as a second language learner. . . Most of my language courses focused heavily on grammar. I felt strongly that grammar and accuracy were vital in a second language classroom.*" Exposure to SLA research and reflections on the source of her earlier beliefs prompted her to reevaluate this perspective. She wrote: "*I no longer believe that explicit grammar instruction should guide a course, but rather supplement tasks, activities and culture, at the appropriate developmental level. I now believe courses should be organized around tasks, not around textbooks and grammatical concepts.*" This demonstrated a resounding change in her attitude towards TBLT. Whereas she had earlier questioned the pedagogical value of TBLT, she now viewed it as the guiding component of the course syllabus. It also demonstrated the effect that SLA research had on her philosophy of teaching, as she now recognized second language acquisition as an organic process that is not directly controlled by activities within the class.

The influence of SLA research on her educational philosophy would also be apparent in other areas. Annika wrote: "*Drills should be used sparingly because they are not interesting and based on behaviourist notions; [however] language acquisition is not linear or habitual. Teaching does not equal learning, and constant repetition of a concept beyond a student's developmental level will not result in that student's* *understanding*." She rationalized a more limited role for drills based on an understanding of their limited effect in promoting acquisition. Moreover, she wrote: "*I have never been in a language classroom that allowed students to participate in decision making. So, initially I felt that the teacher should be responsible for all decisions and was to directly teach students (deductive). However, I now know that what an instructor teaches is not necessarily what students learn. Therefore, I feel that teachers must facilitate learning in any way possible, but must allow students to make decisions, and take responsibility for their own learning*." This belief was in stark contrast to the apprehension she demonstrated at the beginning of the semester towards student-centered lessons. Material from the course helped her to come to the realization that teaching and learning are not directly correlated; therefore, attempts to control learning would be futile.

The most significant change that occurred during the semester was in Annika's perspective towards the ultimate goal of second language education. She noted: "*My biggest change was from believing the goal of second language teaching was NOT to communicate fluently, to now believing it is the ULTIMATE goal*." Her experiences as a learner had led her to believe that the study of language was essential in communication. However, the assumptions inherent in this belief were challenged during discussions in class, leading her to question the pragmatic utility in learning a second language. Annika concluded that speaking accurately like a native speaker was less important than being able to express one's ideas even if the syntax was flawed.

At the conclusion of the course Annika had a very definitive perspective on second language teaching. Whereas at the beginning of the semester she did not feel she knew very much about teaching a second language, at the end of the course she was quite confident in her knowledge of how to teach a second language. The confidence in her knowledge was reflected in the monumental increase in her Task-based language teaching Disposition Scale score from 55 to 86, an increase of 89%. This dramatic increase demonstrated that while she was uncertain about many aspects of second language pedagogy at the beginning of the course, she had very strong views about what should take place in the language classroom at the end of the semester and this meant utilizing TBLT.

Annika's strong views on second language pedagogy would have a significant impact on her practical field experience. Initially Annika was placed with an English mentor teacher and told there would be no opportunity for her to teach a second language. However, after arriving at the school she became aware that Spanish classes were offered to students at three different levels. Annika decided to approach the Spanish teacher and inquire about the possibility of splitting her time between the English classroom and the Spanish classroom. The Spanish program at the school was very small and the teacher was forced to teach split-level classes. Therefore, she gladly welcomed Annika into her classroom and assigned her to teach the Spanish 30 students while she worked with the Spanish 20 students.

Annika's Spanish mentor teacher was a native speaker of the language who had immigrated to Canada from South America. Despite her proficiency in the language, the mentor teacher rarely spoke Spanish to the students in the class. Annika stated: "*She would come over to talk to the students one-on-one and she wouldn't talk in Spanish.*" Moreover, when Spanish was used in class it was always followed by an

English translation. According to Annika, this led students to simply ignore the Spanish that was used by the teacher. "*A lot of explanations were in English so the students wouldn't have to learn the Spanish directions because they knew that the English was always coming.*" Although the students weren't exposed to a lot of Spanish in oral communication, they were expected to use the language perfectly when given the opportunity. Annika explained: "*Every time someone would make a mistake she would correct it.*" The result was that students didn't feel comfortable experimenting with Spanish in the class. She elaborated: "*They are terrified to answer because she is constantly correcting them . . . People would actually answer because they knew for a fact that they weren't wrong, that was the only time that they were willing to take a chance.*" Although the mentor teacher corrected students' errors in order to facilitate their linguistic development, Annika felt it contributed to inhibiting student participation.

With students apprehensive to orally participate in the class, the mentor teacher relied heavily on written activities from the textbook. Annika explained: "*All they would get would be text work . . . All they would do is read the text, do the drill, the fill-in-the-blank kind of questions and that would be it.*" The mentor teacher liked the textbook because it was approved by the government and presented grammar and vocabulary in a way that was easy to use. Nonetheless, Annika felt that the activities presented in the textbook were designed more as an academic exercise rather than an activity to promote language acquisition. She described activities from the textbook in the following manner: "*They were absolutely terrible! The kids got them right every time because all it was, was looking for a key word and knowing whether it was true or* *false*." The activities were not challenging for students because they didn't require genuine communicative abilities. With limited practicality, Annika questioned the efficacy of the activities.

While a considerable amount of time was dedicated to completing activities from the textbook, the mentor teacher also spent a lot of time providing extensive grammatical explanations to students. Annika stated that the mentor teacher would pull out the overhead projector and provide extensive explanations about the rules and applications of specific grammatical forms using technical terms. Although the explicit instruction was beneficial at times in clarifying how complex structures operated, Annika felt that her mentor teacher relied too heavily upon technical explanations provided from the textbook that were not necessarily well suited for the students in the class. She acknowledged though that the mentor teacher's reliance upon technical explanations was largely a result of the fact that she was a native speaker, who had not had to use specific tricks to assist in learning Spanish grammar. Annika explained: "*There are the tricks. Like they are the hints that you learn as you learn the language. But she would never have to do that because it just is her first language*."

The Spanish teacher's practices were diametrically opposed to Annika's philosophy of second language teaching. Whereas the mentor teacher favoured the use of drills and repeated correction to promote accuracy, Annika was a proponent of task-based language teaching and instructional strategies that would promote meaningful interaction. Moreover, the teacher's focus on explicit grammar instruction and written work contradicted Annika's belief in the importance of developing all four language skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) and enhancing grammatical competence through inductive means. The lack of coherence between their educational philosophies did not appear to be significant because the mentor teacher was overtly supportive of experimentation and did not provide any restrictions on Annika, other than to cover the material from the textbook. Nonetheless, Annika felt very inhibited in how she instructed the class because she perceived that there was a degree of tension in their relationship. She stated: "*You have someone watching you like a hawk, not to see if you mess up, but that you don't agree with what they are doing. And it is difficult, you are like this fresh face that is coming in that has just had all this language instruction so you kind of have an idea [of how to teach]. And you have all these grand ideas and they are like scared that you are going to criticize them and that you are going to look at what they are doing and go, well that doesn't agree with what I just learnt.*" Recognizing the political nature of the practicum and the limited power she wielded as a student teacher, Annika sought to avoid being confrontational with her mentor teacher. She stated: "*You don't want to step on any toes and you have so little time and you are a student.*" As a result, she avoided pedagogical discussions with her mentor teacher and adopted classroom practices that would not be considered too radical.

The fact that her mentor teacher taught in a manner that directly contradicted her own views of second language education caused Annika to question and reevaluate her philosophy. "*I get there and I'm seeing the real teacher in action doing all these things that I think are wrong and I'm going, 'am I wrong?' Because I am thinking I am not even finished my third year, I am twenty-one years old, I can't be right. And so you start to question yourself. Like this person has a degree, this person has a job.*" Annika's age and lack of experience caused her to question the efficacy of her philosophy. Her status as a student would further fuel the dilemma for her. "*I was a student and I had all these grand ideas. [I questioned] if they were still right, even though I was a student, or if they were crap because I am a student? And this Spanish teacher is a teacher and that is the end of it.*" The Spanish teacher had many years of experience under her belt, which contributed to her instructional practices in the classroom. Annika, on the other hand, had no experience and had not even achieved the status of a teacher. This led her to question how her views on second language teaching could be justified. The strength of her convictions was evident by the fact that she did not waver. She stated: "*I guess there's never always a right or wrong answer, but there are some things that you just should and shouldn't do.*" She continued: "*You just have to trust yourself I guess, regardless of your [status].*" This demonstrated that Annika understood teaching as a complex, multi-faceted endeavour that could not easily be classified as 'right' or 'wrong.' It also enabled her to justify the differences in the approach assumed by her mentor teacher and herself and to continue to hold strong to her principles.

Based on her principles, Annika sought to instruct students in a manner that was very different from her mentor teacher but would not create problems in the classroom. She thought it was very important to motivate students by involving them in classroom decisions. As a result, she provided students with multiple options for larger activities and regularly consulted with students about their preferences for the class. She reported: "*I don't want to just tell them like okay this is what you are doing and that's the end of the story. So instead I said I have a couple of ideas, you can add to them and then we can decide as a collective.*" In providing multiple options and allowing students to give input into classroom activities, Annika sought to demonstrate that students' opinions were important and that they were valued members of the learning community. She also wanted to ensure that lessons would be interesting and fun for students. She recalled: "*I remember the first day I heard this one kid and he said I hate Spanish. He said I like physics more than I like Spanish. And I thought, oh dear God! That is terrible! I think languages should be fun*." Therefore, she tried to include Spanish culture as much as possible in her lessons using popular Spanish artists such as Shakira and designed activities that would appeal to students' sense of humour.

In addition to ensuring that activities would be engaging, she also wanted to utilize classroom tasks that would be relevant for students. One of the topics she was designated to teach was about jobs. Rather than follow the activities presented in the textbook that she didn't deem to be interesting or relevant, Annika decided to design a series of lessons that would develop skills relevant to applying for a job in addition to Spanish skills. She explained: "*We were doing a unit on jobs because I had to follow the textbook and so I thought why not do something practical? So I taught them how to make a cover letter and I got them to make cover letters for a job that they might want in the future*." After designing the cover letters Annika also had students conduct mock interviews in order to become familiar with some of the questions that may be asked and how best to address them.

In attempting to make her instruction relevant and practical, Annika tried to get students to interact as much as possible in Spanish, even if it was about something as simple as what they had done over the weekend. Initially students were resistant to speak; however, Annika encouraged the use of Spanish by not mandating its usage but continuing to use it herself. She explained her strategy: "*I tried to start with something like asking about how their day was or how their weekend was or what they were planning to do and so tried to get them talking. And they tried to do it in English first and then I would just keep talking in Spanish and kind of just like hoping one of them would and then eventually the other ones would. But I don't want to be like you have to speak in Spanish.*" Her patient approach eventually paid off as students began to feel more comfortable with expressing themselves in Spanish. The use of communicative tasks as an assessment tool also promoted the importance of developing one's oral capabilities.

Throughout the practicum Annika experimented with the use of tasks, an inductive approach to teaching grammar and other strategies she had been exposed to during the curriculum class. She felt they were successful in promoting language acquisition and she enjoyed how students' positively responded to them. Nonetheless, she often resorted to a deductive, drill-based approach due to numerous factors. The school where she was teaching was well endowed with technological equipment; however, there was only one textbook available and limited additional materials. The textbook that was available was structured around a deductive approach to instruction and Annika felt the activities were very limiting and not very practical. She tried to develop her own materials for the class but this proved to be a very cumbersome undertaking. When asked if the time required to develop materials inhibited her use of TBLT, she replied, "*Exactly, but that's what I tried to do. Like I tried to make everything from scratch.*" When this wasn't feasible due to time constraints, she drew upon the resources she had been instructed with as a learner. The result was the continued use of exercises to develop students' accuracy. She lamented: "*It's just frustrating in that regard and I didn't just want to give them worksheets, but that's all I had for resources and you know I was drained.*"

Time limitations, in terms of covering the material, were also a factor in her instruction. Annika was instructed by her mentor teacher that she had to cover a certain number of chapters from the textbook during the four weeks she was teaching. The curriculum that the teacher wanted covered largely consisted of selected vocabulary and grammatical structures. Annika struggled with balancing what she deemed to be meaningful instruction with covering the material sought after by her mentor teacher. She stated: "*Like to do the things that I think would be more meaningful I don't know how to balance like fitting in the curriculum magically into a task.*" Her inability to provide meaningful learning episodes while still covering the material, led her to utilize activities that would assist students in achieving success on tests. These activities were very structured and didn't allow for the contextualized use of language.

Moreover, the lack of support given to Annika inhibited her ability to instruct the class as she desired. Going into the practicum Annika anticipated that she would work collaboratively with her mentor teacher and receive feedback from numerous individuals within the school, including the university facilitator and other student teachers. However, her mentor teacher was busy teaching at the same time that she was and additional support was never provided. Annika noted: "*There wasn't a lot of supervision. Like some of my fellow student teachers said that [other teachers] would sit in on the class and they'd constantly be writing notes. I didn't get a lot of that. No one wanted to look at my lesson plans. So I was like, I am reflective enough that I will* *sit back from a lesson and go that didn't work or this worked or that was great. But some things you don't even realize, that you are not even thinking about.*" Annika felt that the lack of support was particularly influential because she had never taught in a language class before. She stated: "*I don't have like a giant bag on my shoulder that I can just pull all these different ideas out of. You know, especially in the classroom that is so dynamic.*" Lacking support she turned to the practices that were familiar.

Further complicating the situation for Annika was the belief that the university hadn't adequately prepared her for stepping into a classroom. Annika believed that the courses she had taken at the university stressed theories that were too rigid to be useful in real life contexts. She explained: "*I think we got so much crap thrown at us that I think no one is going to use . . . I still agree that you need some of the theory because it definitely got some ideas rolling in everyone's heads. But to just definitively say this is how it is going to happen and this is what you are going to do, it doesn't work that way.*" Moreover, she felt that the theories introduced at the university would have been more relevant if students had already had experiences working in a school. As the program was currently structured though, she thought the division between theory and practice undermined students' effectiveness during the practicum. "*You have all this information that you've had thrown at you and it's the most stressful semester you've had and you're supposed to somehow magically filter it all and use it usefully and put it into practice. Well, that's not how it works.*" For Annika the unrealistic expectations placed on students simply led to a feeling of frustration.

The frustration that Annika felt was not only a result of the expectations placed on students by the program but also her own personal expectations. Annika had entered into the teaching profession because she wanted to make a difference in the lives of students and she wanted to develop meaningful learning episodes. However, once the practicum began she struggled with balancing her own desired approach to teaching with the constraints placed on her by the situation. She explained: "*I have all these ideas and wonderful things you want to do but you are so limited in the classroom. And you don't just want to say oh it's too limited and then cop out. Like I don't want to do that. I don't want to be one of those teachers that tries and goes, whatever, I'll just teach them the bare minimum.*" She continued, "*I feel like I could do so much better and I didn't. You know what I mean? You are under certain conditions but it's like just an excuse after another excuse.*" Annika acutely felt the contradiction between the realities of the classroom and her ideals about teaching; however, she didn't want to assume a defeatist attitude by simply attributing failures to factors outside of her control and conceding that change wasn't possible. "*I feel that I did a few things that were right but there were things that I wish I knew how to do and want to learn how to do so I cannot just have worksheet after worksheet and stuff like that.*" It was important to Annika to continue her professional growth by learning new strategies that would enable her to more consistently follow her teaching philosophy. This was consistent with the belief established during the practicum that teachers need to assume responsibility for classroom events and adopt an active role in promoting change. "*I am now fully in the mind set that it's me and that I have to change something. And like you can't blame [students] for it and that if they're not listening, if it's not working it's probably because the lesson isn't as effective.*" This attitude gave her hope that her perceived failure during the practicum would be rectified in the future and she could genuinely make a difference.

Throughout the curriculum course and the practical field experience Annika demonstrated that she is a critically reflective professional who is able to analyze situations from multiple perspectives. She was aware of the overt restrictions on her practices; however, she also understood that tacit influences that are not readily apparent without deep reflection also impact what takes place in the classroom. She explained that most teachers ignore these influences because it is easier: "*You can't help your circumstances sometimes. It's just so much easier to look at it on the surface because it will help you sleep at night. If you don't look that deep it'll be okay. But in the end you'll regret it and you'll be sad that you missed out on all those opportunities that you could have helped people.*" Not wanting to undermine her ability to make a difference, Annika engaged in regular critical reflection on her practices even though it added to the frustration she felt. The critical reflection helped her to understand the influence that her practices had on students within the class. She comprehended the significance of the 'hidden curriculum' and sought to promote a classroom environment that promoted student autonomy and the principles of democracy. She also understood that schools are political entities that favour particular students. She stated: "*I just think that school caters to a very particular mould. It's like the middle class kid who doesn't have a job and whose parents support them and help them with their school work.*" As a result, she tried to be very flexible with students and to promote critical reflection about social topics. For example, Annika organized an activity in which students analyzed the cultural frames used by advertisers to market their product. This helped the students to broaden their perspective and to understand the source of appeal for particular products.

Annika's critical reflection also helped her to understand some of the tacit influences on her practices. She was keenly aware of societal expectations placed on teachers: "*If you come into a classroom and the students are writing silently, that's the sign of a good classroom.*" In a second language classroom, Annika also felt that there were expectations that grammar would be learnt from an expert grammarian. In combination with this traditional view of the teacher, she also felt that teachers were expected to always provide creative, invigorating activities that captured students' interest. This was an expectation that she did not believe was realistic though: "*I want to be one of those great teachers that everyone talks about that doesn't exist. But I don't know if it's possible in the society, in the system we're in.*" Although she was idealistic, she was also a realist.

Armed with knowledge about multi-dimensional influences on classroom activities, Annika adopted a very positive outlook on her future practices. Although she had been dissatisfied with her performance during the practicum, she perceived this as just one step in becoming the teacher she wanted to be. She stated: "*I might not have the greatest ideas right now or know how to implement my great ideas, but I think I am on my way to being a good teacher.*" Part of this was fueled by her desire to improve her professional knowledge and skills; however, it was also prompted by her understanding in the importance of being strategic in promoting change. She exclaimed: "*To come into a school and go, I am going to revolutionize everything and this is what I think it is going to be, you are going to get shot down . . . So you have to* *find a happy medium in terms of expectations of what is appropriate in the classroom.*" She continued: "*You have to be willing to stand up for what you believe in. But you have to be smart enough to not come in and get everyone's guard up. So you just have to find out who also is a little more radical and get them on your side.*" According to Annika, getting other teachers 'on one's side' would occur once the efficacy of a new approach was demonstrated.

The practicum was a difficult, trying experience for Annika; however, it didn't affect her core beliefs about second language pedagogy. She strongly supported the use of TBLT and classroom strategies that would promote meaningful interaction and transformative learning. Nonetheless, she adopted a realistic perspective that her instructional practices would be based on her philosophy of education mediated by contextual factors.

The Story of Brooke

Brooke grew up in a western European country in which it was mandatory to study at least two foreign languages. As a result, she experienced over ten years of instruction under the tutelage of approximately fifteen different second language teachers. Despite the great number of teachers she had as a learner, Brooke was exposed to a singular manner of teaching. She wrote: "*It seemed that teachers worked under an implicit professional consensus.*" The 'agreed upon' manner of instruction was very teacher-directed and structured. The teacher would introduce the vocabulary and grammatical structures that would be the focus of the lesson using a text and then provide written activities to solidify students' understanding of the introduced concepts. The target language was rarely used by the instructor, as the focus of the lesson would be on discussing the grammatical structures introduced. She explained: "*Around 70% of the time our native language would be used to articulate the grammar rules introduced after the presentation of the text and at the end of the class as well.*" When the target language was used it was primarily done in a structured, repetitive manner or in written form. Very little genuine communication took place using the target language. This created the perception that "*learning a language was mostly an individual process*."

The academic standards for the courses Brooke took were very high. Students were given copious amounts of homework and were expected to demonstrate mastery of the concepts introduced prior to attending subsequent lessons. As a result, the accuracy of the language used was emphasized and errors were immediately corrected. She noted that the correction provided was limited to an identification of the existence of an error rather than an explanation of the error itself. "*Mistakes on answers were not provided. We only knew if we were right or wrong. The answers were scripted in the textbook*." Learner autonomy and self-motivated learning were critical components of the instruction she was exposed to. It was unquestioningly accepted that students would complete their homework and take the necessary steps to ensure they were prepared for classes.

Brooke enjoyed her learning experiences and described several components of the instruction favorably. She thought the structured, organized manner in which classes were conducted to be very effective. She remarked that it was "*simple, straight forward and predictable*." Students knew what was expected of them and the routines of the class mitigated wastage of time. Moreover, she appreciated the demanding nature of the courses, as she believed this motivated her and her colleagues to achieve higher levels of accomplishment. She noted that teachers did not try to make lessons easy for the sake of learning convenience but rather challenged students in guiding them towards the mastery of language.

Despite her appreciation for the instruction she received as a second language learner, Brooke also identified deficiencies in the approach assumed by her teachers. Most notably, she was critical of the lack of student involvement in the lesson. The teacher assumed a dominant role in instruction, leaving little opportunity for students to utilize their language skills. This contributed to an imbalance between the written skills that were developed during the completion of individual exercises and the oral skills that were largely neglected. Brooke felt that the incorporation of more group work and a greater balance between teacher-centered and student-centered instruction would help to mitigate this divide. She also felt that this would give students a greater sense of accomplishment, as it would reinforce the reason why they were learning the language – to develop communicative abilities.

The influence of her learning experiences on her conception of the teaching-learning process in a second language classroom was evident in her assessment of the various lessons provided. She found the structure of the PPP lesson to be very appealing. From her perspective, the progressive nature of the activities utilized in the class fostered a productive learning environment in which student confusion would be mitigated. She wrote: "*The lesson is clear. The rules are well explained. Students have many occasions to practice and understand their mistakes. . . There is little chance for misconceptions*." In addition to promoting clarity for students, she also articulated that the approach would be uncomplicated for teachers to implement, noting that it left little room for interference and was almost "*square*." Nonetheless, she found fault in the fact that the lesson inhibited self-initiated language usage by limiting students to responding to the teacher's questions.

In contrast, she found the participative nature of the ESA lesson to be appealing. She claimed that high school students would probably enjoy the lesson because of its interactive nature and the fact that it required critical and creative thinking skills. Moreover, she believed the open-ended, discovery-oriented make-up of the lesson would be very motivating for students. However, she expressed concerns over the structure of the lesson. The teacher has less control over the progression of the lesson than in the traditional instruction Brooke was familiar with and, therefore, she felt the success of the lesson was highly dependent on the students within the class. This motivated her to assert that the lesson would be more appropriate for an experienced teacher to implement than a novice teacher with limited professional expertise. Despite her misgivings about the lesson, Brooke identified it as the type of lesson she would most like to use as a teacher.

Whereas positive and negative elements of the aforementioned lessons were identified, Brooke only had negative comments for the TBLT lesson. Although language production was identified as a potential benefit of the lesson, Brooke expressed that this advantage was undermined by the potential damage that the lesson could cause to students' confidence. "*If students have little knowledge, the lesson could reinforce blockage. Gaining confidence is gradual. Some students might be totally overwhelmed and find the learning of a second language purposeless*." As demonstrated by this final statement, she questioned the very purpose of the lesson. From her perspective the lesson didn't serve a tangible function because students would already have to be able to use the language in order to participate in the lesson. "*Unless students have already a mastery of the second language, I don't see the point of the lesson. It seems to be more of a discussion session than learning session. Nothing seems to be related to a second language*." This quote demonstrates the strong impression that her apprenticeship of observation made on her conception of second language learning as consisting of the introduction and analysis of specific teaching points.

Based on her experiences as a language learner, Brooke had a very prescribed philosophy of second language pedagogy when she entered into the teacher education program. Exposure to one isolated style of teaching prompted her to believe that there was a consensus over the virtues of a structured, teacher-centered approach to instruction. The second language curriculum course would challenge this assumption and expose her to a wealth of alternative approaches. She wrote: "*I did not realize how much of an impact my experiences as a learner would have on my beliefs until this year. The reflections and discussions conducted in the class and the exposure to different theories, methods, and techniques contributed to enlarge my perceptions of SL teaching. Upon reflection, the language acquisition theories (especially the distinction between comprehensible input, explicit knowledge and output) had a particularly catalytic effect*." One of the greatest influences that these theories had was on her perspective towards the importance of explicit grammar instruction (see Appendix G). As demonstrated earlier, Brooke was exposed to and enjoyed the explicit analysis of grammatical forms provided by her teachers. This perspective remained largely unchallenged until she was confronted by research that brought the value of explicit grammatical knowledge (see for example Krashen, 1982) into question and she was forced to analyze the source of her beliefs. Upon questioning her tacit understanding about the importance of grammatical knowledge, Brooke came to a major revelation: "*As a younger student, I was satisfied with this method of teaching because I felt comfortable within a structured environment. Grammar was my strength. Moreover, I did not like to perform in front of the class because I was shy and had a huge lack of self-confidence. This is probably why, until recently, I might have been inclined to believe that the way I was taught was the right way to teach.*" The realization that her own personal preferences resulted in her advocacy of explicit grammar instruction caused her to reevaluate her perspective.

A corollary of this new perspective towards the importance of explicit grammar instruction was a diminishing belief in the importance of drills. Although Brooke had enjoyed completing structured exercises as a student, exposure to the literature on acquisition sequences (see Lightbown & Spada, 1999 for a succinct review) and arguments that questioned the value of drills in the acquisition process (see Wong & Van Patten, 2003), caused her to question the value of such techniques. In their place she favoured the use of activities that would promote creativity and allow students opportunities to use the language they were learning. In explaining her pedagogical philosophy at the end of the class she wrote: "*Students will be encouraged to learn if they are given the opportunity to use what they have just learned. Activities to promote output are crucial to learning, as well as the practice of inductive grammar exercises.*

Instructional techniques, such as group or individual activities, foster creative production. For those who will not have the chance to become immersed in their SL culture, it is important to give them the chance to speak the language they are learning." In addition to emphasizing the importance of opportunities for students to use language, this quote also demonstrates the evolution of her beliefs from emphasizing the explicit analysis of grammar to learning grammar through inductive means.

The transformation in her perspective towards explicit grammar instruction and interactive teaching strategies resulted in her philosophy of second language teaching being more coherent with the principles of TBLT. On the TBLT Disposition Scale Brooke's score jumped twelve points from 54 to 66. This constitutes a very significant 35% increase. Nonetheless, Brooke demonstrated a skeptical perspective towards using TBLT in the classroom. "*Starting strictly from the task, for me, is a little bit difficult. Unless it is a task, which kind of follows the objective of a previous unit, and they have a little background for it, then we can [do it]. But I think when beginners have so little [knowledge], that's very hard for them to do any kind of activity*." Furthermore, she expressed reservations about the amount of time required to develop TBLT lessons. She explained: "*It demands preparation and all the teachers I was introduced to, they seemed to be totally overwhelmed by time*." The perceived time demands of the teaching profession made the utilization of TBLT a daunting task, in particular for a novice teacher who lacked significant resources.

The fact that Brooke was unconvinced about the merits of TBLT was further reinforced by her concept map. Brooke designed a visual representation of her philosophy of second language education that portrayed tasks as one of numerous instructional techniques (including drills and exercises) that have value in the language classroom. Tasks are included on the right side of the map along with other cognitively challenging techniques. These techniques were identified as student-centered techniques that allowed for personal growth while learning a second language. She wrote: "*I tried to emphasize the idea of personal growth. If a student remains at a very teacher-centered level, there is little chance that he/she will become motivated in learning a second language. All levels of instruction are legitimate but focus should be put on the progress based on the cognitive level attained by the student: becoming better in a second language subject is not about being able to do more drills at a higher accuracy but it is about being able to use what has been learned for personal purposes*." This quote demonstrates that the value of student-centered techniques, such as tasks, lie in their ability to motivate students. It also demonstrates that Brooke perceived of language learning as a progressive process culminating with the free use of language that had been learned. This viewpoint clearly contrasts the principles of TBLT – mainly that language acquisition cannot be controlled and acquisition occurs through the meaningful use of language.

In addition to revealing her skepticism about TBLT, Brooke's concept map also demonstrated that she had a keen understanding about the complex nature of classroom interactions. At the top and bottom of the map she identified external influences that have a significant bearing on classroom interactions. At the top of the map she identified external influences that relate to the professional culture of the school. These included learning objectives from the program of study and the personal beliefs of teachers within the school. At the bottom of the map she identified community influences on the educational endeavour, including the cultural background of students and the expectations of the community. These external influences were portrayed as funnels, which then determine the strategies and techniques that will be applied by the teacher. The important influence that contextual factors have on a teacher's instructional practices caused Brooke to be uncertain as to how she would instruct students during the practicum. She wrote: "*I cannot predict my methods and my styles yet because there are so many other factors which will come into place, but I will certainly put more emphasis on what I now consider to be the more meaningful aspects of SL learning.*" Although she could not predict exactly how she would structure the courses she would teach, she was fairly confident that interactive strategies that promoted the meaningful use of the target language would be the staple of her classes.

Brooke's practical field experience was characterized by two distinct experiences. Scheduling problems prevented her from spending the entire day with her assigned mentor teacher, so it was determined that she would also spend time working in another classroom. As a result, half of the practicum was spent teaching Spanish and the other half teaching German. In the Spanish class Brooke was paired with a mentor teacher who relied heavily upon distance materials to deliver the course. She explained: "*The Spanish class relied on the Alberta Distance Learning and all the material which would go with it. There were a lot of exercises [and] a lot of vocabulary, like the students were exposed to, I don't know, fifty different words a day. And there were drills all the time.*" The focus of the class was on developing written skills and few opportunities were provided to converse in Spanish. When opportunities for speaking in Spanish were provided, they typically consisted of responding in some limited way to a question posed by the teacher or repeating vocabulary in chorus after the teacher. The only time students conversed with each other for pedagogical purposes was to seek support in completing assignments, an activity that almost exclusively occurred using the students' native tongue.

Although she portrayed the material being learned as quite 'dry', Brooke claimed that the students enjoyed the Spanish class. Her mentor teacher was a very engaging and sociable individual who developed a positive rapport with students by assuming the role of entertainer. Brooke stated: "*He had very good contact with his students, like joking around all the time. And you could see that they appreciated him. And [he] incorporated a lot of little anecdotes and you know talking about hockey is what they like.*" In addition to joking around with the students the mentor teacher also assumed a very lax attitude to classroom management. Students were allowed to sit in pods and the mentor teacher gave students regular 'talk breaks' throughout lessons to allow them to interact with their neighbours about non-Spanish topics.

When Brooke assumed control over the class she was very restricted in the options made available to her. The mentor teacher didn't want the routines of his class disrupted and, therefore, Brooke was asked to mimic his instructional approach. Although she claimed that this was an approach that she definitely would not utilize if given the choice, Brooke expressed appreciation over having been exposed to a different style of teaching. When asked to assess the efficacy of the approach adopted, Brooke generally expressed satisfaction over the learning that took place. She believed that the class involved too much of a focus on learning vocabulary and completing drills, which led to "*regurgitating words but not knowing how to put the words together*." Nonetheless, she expressed confidence in the approach of her mentor teacher in ensuring that the content of the curriculum would be covered. She also was supportive of the fact that reliance on the modules freed her up to diagnose individual students' problems and provide individualized support. "*Well, the good part of it is I would go through the desks and look at each students' [work] and see their specific mistakes and then I would know what would need to be reviewed*." Although it was not her preferred style of instructing students, she did not question its efficacy in promoting learning.

While she was comfortable with the instructional approach adopted in the Spanish classroom, she struggled with classroom management. The Spanish mentor teacher didn't want to jeopardize the positive rapport he had with students in the class, so he disallowed Brooke from 'punishing' students in any way. In reflecting upon how she could address disruptive behaviour, she stated: "*I would have separated them right away but my teacher didn't really want to because they are buddies and you know you cannot really expect to separate buddies*." In addition to limiting the options available to Brooke, the mentor teacher also pushed her to adopt his strategy of entertaining the students in the class through anecdotes and jokes. Brooke struggled with this expectation though. She explained: "*I didn't want to impose myself as a cool teacher right away. You know, it's just like a feeling thing, like I didn't feel like telling anecdotes right from the beginning. It was just at the end [of the practicum] when I felt more comfortable with the class and . . . [was] able to include anecdotes*." Restricted in the strategies that could be used and uncomfortable managing the class by entertaining students, Brooke struggled with classroom management. She described numerous stories about uncooperative and disruptive behaviour that she encountered in the class. These behavioural issues made her experience in the Spanish class very difficult. "*Spanish was more strenuous. I had some good days, very good days, and I had some very bad days where I couldn't get [students] to work at all,*" she stated. Classroom management issues and her inability to contribute something novel to the class motivated Brooke to perceive that she had a negative influence on the students.

In contrast to the Spanish class, Brooke enjoyed a great deal of freedom to conduct the German class as she desired. Brooke's German mentor teacher was very supportive and he made sure that she was perceived as the teacher by the students in the class. She explained: "*My German teacher made sure that he was away from the first day. So I was alone in the classroom for four weeks with my German class and so they considered me as the teacher.*" Moreover, he encouraged her to take risks and experiment with a variety of instructional and management strategies. The supportive environment provided by the mentor teacher gave Brooke confidence and encouraged her to take risks in the classroom.

When Brooke assumed responsibility for the instruction in the class she decided that she wanted to experiment with small group activities. She strongly believed that students require at least a basic understanding of German grammar in order to converse in the language. She stated: "*In German there are cases and the cases are related to the function of the word in the sentence.*" As a result, Brooke decided to experiment with an interactive lesson to inductively introduce the nominative and accusative cases. She provided students with a text and asked them to point out examples of each case from the sentences provided. She was not aware at the time that students had very limited knowledge about language cases and, therefore, did not account for the students experiencing difficulties. She explained the result: "*They ended up talking and doing something else because they couldn't do it.*" Although she acknowledged that they didn't have the requisite skills to complete the activity, she attributed the failure of the lesson to her inability to control the learning process. She wasn't confident with her classroom management skills or her ability to organize group activities to promote learning. She noted: "*I just didn't know what to do in order to be effective.*" This feeling heightened the insecurities she already felt as a new teacher entering into the classroom. She explained: "*Maybe the first week or two I was so self-conscious about teaching . . . It is so consuming because you want to do everything that you plan to do and you wake up in the middle of the night and say, 'oh did I do everything right or am I ready for tomorrow?' And so probably the lack of experience for sure, like the first time you don't know what is going on.*" To regain control over the learning that was taking place in the classroom, she reverted to the teacher-centered instruction she had been familiar with as a learner. "*So I mostly did explicit instruction and then gave them a lot of exercises to practice.*"

Brooke's practical field experience had a significant effect on her philosophy of second language education. Whereas at the end of the curriculum course she felt confident in how to teach in a second language classroom, the practicum caused her to re-evaluate her perspective. She stated: "*Before I had a compact way of thinking, like I had really specific things in mind which seemed to be final in some way. But then I realized that, for example group activities, I thought that group activities were very* *important but then I noticed that it's not that easy to apply in a big class, in a big classroom.*" She further stated: "*Then after my IPT it's just like okay you have this basic idea to start with and then you have to know your class and your students and for them adapt. I think I didn't think so much about adaptation before.*" Although she had recognized the influence of external factors in the construction of her concept map at the conclusion of the course, she hadn't realized the extent to which contextual factors would influence her instructional practices. She continued to believe in the importance of what she termed "*meaningful elements of SL instruction*"; however, support for these elements of instruction in practice were tempered by her perceived lack of skill in controlling the learning environment.

One area where her 'compact' way of thinking was challenged was in her beliefs about student autonomy. As a language learner she had been very interested in the study of language and had dedicated herself to her studies. In fact the rigorous nature of the courses she had taken demanded that all students be self-motivated learners. This perspective continued through the curriculum course as demonstrated by the emphasis given to student-directed learning strategies on her concept map. However, when she began the practicum she was shocked by the lack of responsibility demonstrated by students. She recalled: "*Once I gave them homework to try to find a picture of their family and give the physical description of the person. Out of 26 only three gave the work back.*" She explained that the school had an unwritten policy whereby students were not given extensive amounts of homework; however, she was still flabbergasted by the incredibly poor completion rate. Student irresponsibility was not restricted to work habits outside of the classroom though. Brooke recounted with great dismay how seemingly common sense study behaviours were not followed by students in the class: "*Some students really don't pay attention. Even if I give the correction on the board and I go through it with them and I go tell them to write it down . . . then five minutes later I would go back to them and they still wouldn't have done it. So I mean for me it was common sense that if I would write down something on the board, everybody would, but that's where you realize that it's not the case.*"

This realization promoted an inner conflict for Brooke. On the one hand she witnessed how little responsibility students took for their own learning. On the other hand, she strongly believed in the importance of student responsibility and participation in the learning process. Further complicating the situation was the general perception promoted at the university that the teacher is responsible for the learning taking place. She stated: "*At university they say well you know that's your responsibility to make the students feel responsible for their own learning and, you know, if they are disruptive it is because they are bored. Maybe you have to reconsider the way you are teaching.*" This attitude promoted a sense of guilt in Brooke and motivated her to advocate asserting her control over the learning process by teaching students how to learn. She explained her philosophy: "*I think the teacher ought to show the students the way to learn because if some want to go to the university or whatever, they are going to have to know [how to learn].*" In addition to preparing the more gifted students for success in higher education, she also believed that developing learning strategies would encourage students to become more self-motivated and effective learners.

While the practicum challenged her 'compact' perspective on second language education, one area that was not affected was her disposition towards the use of TBLT.

Brooke's TDS score dropped one point from the end of the curriculum course to 65. This demonstrates that her core beliefs remained relatively constant. Nonetheless, these beliefs were tempered by the realization that contextual factors may force her to alter her approach. In reference to how she would organize her classroom in the future, she stated: "*I like group activities, I think it is very important but I would need to know my students more and be more comfortable with that.*"

Moreover, Brooke's skepticism about TBLT was heightened by her experiences during the practicum. She continued to question the efficacy of TBLT based on the amount of time required to plan lessons and cover the material from the curriculum. She also began to question whether she could realistically utilize TBLT in the classroom based on her confidence in her teaching skills. In discussing her planning habits she relayed: "*The more prepared I was, the less vulnerable I would feel.*" In other words, the more certain she was about the progression of the lesson, the more comfortable she felt entering into the classroom. As a novice teacher who was self-conscious about her abilities as an educator, teacher-centered lessons provided her with security. Furthermore, she questioned whether students had the confidence or skills to be able to participate in a TBLT lesson. "*In the beginning I find it very difficult [to use a task], because they are just not confident. The students hide anyway. They were fine afterwards but from the start they needed some kind of material.*" Brooke clearly viewed learning as dependent upon materials provided by the teacher. From her perspective this often meant the introduction of vocabulary or a particular grammatical structure.

The Story of Catriona

Catriona's first experiences as a second language learner came relatively late in life. When she was eighteen years old she participated in a Rotary Youth Exchange to Ukraine. During the course of the year in the European country she became acquainted with Ukrainian culture and developed an extensive vocabulary and strong comprehension skills. However, she was never satisfied with her ability to communicate in Ukrainian and returned to Canada somewhat frustrated by the fossilization of her language skills. She wrote: "*Few Ukrainians speak English, so it was difficult for anyone to explain Ukrainian grammar to me. This was very frustrating because I could not figure out how the grammar worked. By the end of the year, I had a very large Ukrainian vocabulary, but I had difficulties expressing myself. Most of the time people could understand what I was saying, but I always said the verbs in the wrong person or tense.*"

When she returned home she enrolled in a local college and started to study Ukrainian. The courses she took were structured in a very similar manner following a PPP sequence. Vocabulary was introduced at the beginning of the class, followed by grammar, grammar activities and finally a speaking activity. In most of the courses English was the language of instruction and Ukrainian was used to practice what had been introduced. The instructors corrected students' mistakes all of the time to ensure that bad habits were not being formed.

Catriona felt that the courses were too quickly paced to allow students to master the concepts introduced. Moreover, she didn't like the extensive use of English in the classroom. Nonetheless, she appreciated the fun, engaging activities that the students participated in and thought that the repetitive nature of the classes (reinforcing concepts through several activities) helped promote language acquisition. After the frustration of not being able to express herself accurately, the overt focus on grammar and mastery learning in the class were viewed as a welcome change. "*When I returned to Canada, I took a Ukrainian course at [a local community college]. I remember clearly the first class that we focused on grammar because it felt so good to finally understand how to correctly conjugate a verb.*" She continued to explain how these experiences contributed to her beliefs about language teaching. "*For these reasons, my language pedagogy beliefs at the beginning of the semester were strongly in favour of teaching more grammar.*"

Catriona's preference for explicit grammar instruction and mastery learning were reflected in her lesson analyses and language pedagogy beliefs scale (see Appendix H). Although she responded uncertain to statements regarding grammar knowledge enhancing the ability to use language (statement #23) and explicit grammatical knowledge as being essential to language learning (statement #16), this is more a reflection of her uncertainty about theories of language learning rather than her belief about grammar's role in the classroom.

Catriona's analysis of the PPP, ESA and TBLT lessons further explicated her strong preference for a deductive approach to introducing grammar. In commenting on the ESA lesson she wrote: "*I am not a big fan of the inductive approach because I think it is very difficult for some students to see what is being taught. I would have explained [the grammatical concepts] first.*" Her dislike of an inductive approach and belief in the role of grammar as the focus of a lesson are demonstrated in this excerpt about the

TBLT lesson: "*I dislike the topic used to explain the grammar in this lesson. I don't like how the main goal of the lesson is taught through teacher assistance while they are doing their presentation. There isn't very much repetition and it may be confusing for the students to understand the point of the lesson.*" She identified the main goal of the lesson as being the structures used by students when presenting to the class. This demonstrates a view that classroom instruction should be based on the introduction of particular forms and that learning should take place in a structured, pre-determined manner. Her comments also demonstrate a predisposition towards the PPP sequence in which students are given repeated opportunities to practice a particular form.

Catriona's appreciation for a clearly sequenced lesson was based on its pedagogical value but also its ease to implement. In reference to the PPP lesson she wrote: "*This would be very easy for the teacher to present. They would have time to explain and then make sure the students understand while they are doing their work.*" The freedom the teacher enjoyed to prepare prior to the lesson and to provide individual assistance while students worked was a significant benefit. In contrast, Catriona described the TBLT lesson in the following manner: "*I think this lesson would be difficult to deliver because it would be hard to keep the students' attention and difficult to explain the grammar concepts.*" Classroom management was identified as a major impediment to the utilization of TBLT as was the teacher's ability to provide assistance with forms that the students deemed problematic.

Negative perceptions about TBLT resulted in a score of 59 on the TBLT Disposition Scale. This low score was the result of her view of second language teaching as imparting knowledge about various linguistic structures. Although a product view of language instruction pervaded her beliefs, Catriona also demonstrated support for certain elements of instruction typically associated with a process view of language education, including the importance of negotiating tasks, the value of using tasks to promote language acquisition, the unpredictability of lesson outcomes and the need for flexibility in adapting lessons. Support for these aspects of language education demonstrated that Catriona perceived value in certain elements of TBLT. Nonetheless, her preference for grammar-based mastery learning and qualms about the actual implementation of TBLT negated any influence these beliefs may have had in attracting her to the instructional model.

When Catriona enrolled in the methods course she possessed defined but not definitive beliefs about second language pedagogy based on her experiences as a language learner. On the language pedagogy belief scale she only answered strongly agree to one statement, while avoiding strongly disagree all together (see Appendix H). The introduction of various theories and methods of language learning in the course would not cause her beliefs to become stronger; however, they would have a significant influence on how she perceived language teaching should take place. She wrote: "*My pedagogical beliefs have been influenced by the exposure I have had to Krashen's hypotheses, Swain's output hypothesis, Schumann's theory of acculturation or pidginization, and the community language teaching technique. The atmosphere I want to create in my classroom and the lesson plans I choose to apply will take these hypotheses into consideration.*" Krashen's hypotheses supported her earlier established belief in the importance of group work, while Schumann's theory further enhanced her perception that culture is an important element of a language classroom. On the other hand, exposure to the other theories brought about significant changes in her beliefs.

During the course Catriona was assigned to give a presentation to the class about the Community Language Teaching method. The influence of this experience was evident based on her reflections: "*Community language teaching is an inductive student-centered approach. In this technique, the teacher facilitates an atmosphere conducive to learning. The students are self-motivated and self-confident which forms less anxiety*." Catriona believed that the student-initiated and cooperative atmosphere created by the method would effectively promote language learning.

The influence of the Community Language Teaching method could also be seen in its effect on her perception of inductive and deductive approaches to teaching. Whereas prior to the class she strongly favoured a deductive approach, subsequent to the course she wrote: "*I think that an inductive approach would work best to reinforce the students' knowledge. It would also be more rewarding to the students upon their accomplishments such as the ah ha moment*." Her earlier perception of an inductive approach as confusing was replaced by the view that it would promote more meaningful learning that would also have motivational benefits. Moreover, her attitude towards statements relating to the use of explicit grammar instruction changed significantly. This resulted in the perception of culture as the central feature of a syllabus rather than grammatical concepts. She wrote: "*The concept map is framed by images of cultural aspects that should be integrated into each lesson. These would act as a background to the lesson and would initiate student interest, conversation, and general knowledge about the language they are learning*." According to this perspective culture rather than grammar would drive students' learning. These shifts demonstrated that Catriona didn't view explicit grammar instruction as a vital part of a language classroom and that an inductive approach would be more productive.

While exposure to the Community Language Teaching method evoked a change in her perception of grammar instruction, Swain's Output Hypothesis contributed to a more positive perception of TBLT. She wrote: "*Swain's Output Hypothesis would be implemented through the tasks in my classroom. I plan on having students using the language*." This short excerpt revealed that Catriona acknowledged language learning takes place through interaction, even when the focus of the lesson is not on practicing particular structures introduced by the teacher. Catriona's preference for tasks as a learning tool was demonstrated by her diminished interest in utilizing drills or exercises in the classroom. Moreover, her improved disposition towards the utilization of TBLT was reflected in the score she received on the TBLT Disposition Scale – 69. When compared to the 59 score accomplished at the beginning of the semester, it was apparent that the class had a significant effect on her pedagogical beliefs. Nonetheless, Catriona expressed reservations about TBLT based on potential logistical difficulties when utilizing it.

The second language methods course at the university had a moderate influence on Catriona's development as a teacher; the practicum would not. Catriona was placed in a high school with a large student population from a relatively well-endowed neighbourhood. The school facility was very warm and welcoming and the classrooms were bright and appealing. Catriona was initially assigned to a mentor teacher who taught English and French. Through negotiations with her university facilitator and another student teacher, Catriona was able to make arrangements to spend part of the day with her original mentor teacher in English class and the remainder of the day with a mentor teacher who taught Ukrainian. Although language classes in the school normally consisted of approximately 15 to 20 students, the class she was assigned to teach contained 27 students.

Catriona described her English mentor teacher as very stern and traditional in her approach to teaching. She followed a very structured pattern of instruction strictly adhering to a particular textbook. Moreover, she utilized intimidation as a means to control the classroom. Catriona stated that her mentor teacher regularly yelled at students and belittled them in order to promote submissive behaviour. Intimidation wasn't restricted to the students as Catriona also felt very intimidated by the mentor teacher. "*I was afraid that I wouldn't do something right and she would yell at me or something like that. . . Well, she just was very stern. And I don't think that she would really yell. No, I'm sure she wouldn't have yelled, but she was very stern and like she had that look that you didn't want to do something wrong or something bad might happen.*" Feelings of intimidation were enhanced by the mentor teacher's critical demeanour. She did not feel it necessary to praise the student teacher and to point out the strengths of her teaching. Rather, she focused on all the negative aspects that she identified about Catriona's teaching. "*This lady [the English mentor teacher] wasn't as good with constructive criticism. . . She focused a lot on the things I did bad.*"

In addition to being very critical, the English mentor teacher was very particular in how she expected student teachers to teach. She viewed herself as a model teacher and sought to instil similar characteristics in the teachers under her supervision.

Catriona stated: "*I think she wanted us to be exactly like her. Like there was three student teachers in her class and all of us had the same problem. We all had similar difficulties but it was like she thought that a teacher was somebody like her and she wasn't open to new ideas or anything like that. She just wanted us to be exactly like her and to teach like her.*" This meant following the same instructional practices as her. "*The teacher wanted us just to go right from the teacher's guide, right from the book, which I thought would be kind of boring for the students. Because you know you do a story everyday and notes and it was the exact same every day. And some of them did okay and others got really bored with it.*" Despite her concerns with the effectiveness of the approach she followed her mentor teacher's instructions.

Instruction wasn't the only area where the mentor teacher demanded that student teachers mimic her practices; she also demanded that they adopt her methods of managing the classroom. Catriona was a mild mannered individual who believed in demonstrating respect to students and dealing with issues through private discussions. Nonetheless, she adopted the practice of yelling at students. "*There were a lot of things I did in this class that I normally wouldn't. One of the things was yelling. I just think that students don't like it. I think that the students liked when I was in control but I think that I maintained it, like the first lesson that I ever taught was with a sub because the other lady wasn't there and I thought the first two lessons I did were really good and the sub said you know you did a really good job with this class. He was impressed and then the lady came back and I taught the first class and it was completely different. Like she said well you know you gotta . . . pretty much yell at them.*" Despite her success in managing earlier lessons, Catriona heeded her mentor teacher's advice and began to raise her voice as a management tool.

Although Catriona adhered to the mentor teacher's expectations, their relationship was fraught with tension. Catriona felt that she was in a constant power struggle with her mentor. When discussing one of the occasions when her mentor teacher was providing feedback to her, Catriona reflected: "*She was talking about a power struggle between me and the students but . . . I think it was a power struggle between me and her.*" The mentor teacher's need for her student teachers to verify her expertise through mimicry came in direct conflict with the student teacher's desire to experiment and find her own voice. However, the constant criticism provided to Catriona undermined her self-confidence and her perception of herself as a competent teacher. The result was frustration: "*There were a few times when I wanted to cry in this class.*"

Catriona enjoyed a much more cordial relationship with the Ukrainian mentor teacher. Catriona characterized the Ukrainian teacher as very skilled and passionate about teaching. She was very dedicated to her work and impeccably organized. "*She stayed you know and made sure everything was planned and she had a lesson plan everyday and I don't think many teachers do. Yeah and I know she has been doing the exact same thing for 20 years at that school and so you would think that she would have it, but she has to have that hard copy every day even if she just goes back and looks at an old lesson she did. But I thought she was very well organized and knew what she was doing. I think she would have been a good teacher if I was like in high school, I would have liked her.*" The teacher's expertise was based on her thorough knowledge about language forms. She understood the rules that dictate how a language should be used and expected perfection from her students. Catriona regarded her as a "*grammar expert*" and had a great deal of respect for her linguistic knowledge and her skill as a teacher.

Over her career the Ukrainian teacher had adopted a very structured, prescriptive method to teaching. Catriona explained: "*Everything is the same and she teaches all of her classes, French or Ukrainian, the exact same. They do the exact same things and so it's very structured.*" The method she used consisted of using a reading passage to introduce particular vocabulary and grammatical structures that would then be reinforced and used through the completion of several exercises and worksheets. Each unit consisted of two readings. Students would be asked to read the passages and then define underlined words found in the readings using a dictionary. These words would comprise a vocabulary list that students were responsible to remember. Then grammatical concepts that were found in the passage would be analyzed and practiced. Finally, at the end of the unit students would be required to write a composition, make a presentation to the class and complete quizzes relating to the vocabulary and grammar introduced. The materials used in the class were almost exclusively created by the teacher; Catriona stated that she only saw the teacher use a textbook once.

Catriona claimed that the Ukrainian mentor teacher was a very supportive and cooperative individual. She always discussed the positive things that Catriona did in addition to providing constructive criticism. Moreover, she was very interested in hearing about Catriona's courses at the university and her ideas about teaching. Catriona stated: "*She asked me a lot of questions about things that I had learned in* *university and she asked me about this class and she wanted to know like she was open to new ideas and open to new ways and there were even a few things that she said, you know like yeah that's really good. I wish, you know, I think I might start doing that now or something like that.*" The cooperative nature of the teacher made Catriona feel as though they were working together to make her a better teacher.

Despite the openness of the mentor teacher to new ideas, Catriona still felt restricted to follow the method typically used in the class. "*I didn't really feel I had much room to move just because she was so organized and she had everything set out and they had a pattern and all of her students were used to it.*" The efficiency of the mentor teacher was perceived by Catriona to be a major impediment to designing her own lessons. The units were so well constructed and sequenced that she didn't feel she could venture outside of what had already been planned without jeopardizing the flow of the class. The available materials created by the veteran teacher were also perceived as a barrier to operating outside of the prescribed method. If she didn't use the materials created by her mentor teacher, Catriona didn't know how she would be able to cover the material normally covered in a unit. "*I think if I did say, you know could I do it this way [it wouldn't have been a problem]. But it would have been difficult just because like if I said, you know, I don't want to do a reading . . . I would have had to come up with something really big instead because they wouldn't have been able to learn their vocabulary that she wanted to learn and stuff like that. And then for her to carry on after I left would have been difficult for her too.*" Therefore, adjusting instruction would have been burdensome for the students, the mentor teacher and herself. As a result, she stuck to the guidelines of the method advocated by her mentor.

Although the situation in the two classes in which Catriona taught were very different, they were the same in the sense that she felt obligated to mimic the practices of her more experienced mentors. She perceived that she did not have any option other than to adopt a style of instruction that she could not foresee herself using in the future. This resulted in a perceived division between the practicum and what she deemed real teaching. "*When I have my own classroom I will do it my own way. I just did it like this for now just because I had to.*" The perception of the practicum as an act of jumping through hoops rather than assisting in the process of her professional development, undermined its effectiveness in preparing her to become a principled practitioner. It also created a politicized attitude toward the whole experience: "*The one thing I found about the IPT is that you have to do exactly what the teacher says because if you don't, like they're marking you right and pretty much you know I did anything they wanted me to just because they say if I pass or fail . . . Like it was fun to kind of go and do it but you knew in the back of your mind that you're always being judged and if you slipped up and if you did something wrong or if the teacher just, like her personality just clashed or something like that, there was nothing you could do about it.*" This statement demonstrated her attitude that the practicum and her evaluation were not just about her performance but also her relationship with her mentor teachers. If she brought their competency into question by adopting practices that conflicted with her mentor teachers, she would risk damaging her relationship with them and potentially jeopardize a passing grade for the practicum. This politicized perspective affected how she approached the practicum and where she dedicated her efforts. Understanding the experience to be about appeasing those who controlled her fate in the practicum, Catriona made every effort to do what the teacher wanted, even if it meant undermining the benefits of the experience on her professional development.

Catriona's survivalist approach to the practicum resulted in it having a negligible influence on her development as a teacher. When asked to comment on the influence of the IPT on her beliefs about language pedagogy, she responded: "*I don't really think my beliefs changed all that much because that's pretty much what I thought before*." The absence of meaningful experiences to challenge existing beliefs left previously established perceptions of second language teaching largely in tact. As a result, only minor changes occurred in her perception of foreign language teaching.

Prior to the semester Catriona believed that repeated error correction was valuable for students' linguistic development. Subsequent to the practicum she expressed reservations over the importance of oral correction: "*I think if you are writing it you should know but if you are saying it that is more you know of a spur of the moment thing so if you make a mistake it is not really a big deal. People are still going to understand what you are saying. So I don't really think it is a big deal.*" Comprehension would not be adversely influenced by minor errors, therefore, correction of inconsequential errors was deemed unnecessary. In addition, Catriona believed that error correction would not necessarily lead to improved linguistic production. On the contrary, she expressed the belief that errors would work themselves out over time. "*I didn't really correct a lot of errors like that [minor errors] because I think that maybe it is just me but I think it is something that you just have to get used to. Even I still make errors*." The shift in her perception of the value of correction was reinforced through her responses to statements number one and nine on the pedagogical beliefs scale (see Appendix H).

The importance of drills in language instruction was another area where her beliefs were moderately affected by the practicum. The course caused her to re-evaluate the importance of drills and to consider them as a less attractive option in teaching. Her experiences in the classroom caused her to soften these views and assume a more neutral stance towards the use of drills (statements # 11 and 24). The repeated use of worksheets as part of the mentor teacher's prescribed method of teaching was partially responsible for this. Accustomed to completing worksheets as part of the daily routine of the class, students clamoured for the security provided by the drills. Catriona interpreted students' espoused desire for drills as evidence of their pedagogical value. "*The students wanted them [drills]. Like they asked for you know can we have a worksheet so we could practice this. Like it was good practice I think for them . . . It just seemed they liked it so and they wanted to do it so that was a good thing that they wanted to do it, then I was going to get it for them.*" The focus on drills in the class also reminded Catriona of how she had learned languages. "*I did use worksheets and then when I was like filling them out, like filling out the key or something like that I remembered oh yah, you know this is how I was taught and it actually did help me. Do you know what I mean? And I remembered you know if I wanted to learn it that's what I had to do.*" The assumption that what worked for me will work for them motivated her to assume a more tolerant view of drills.

Despite the influence of the practicum on her beliefs towards error correction and the use of drills, Catriona's general views of language teaching and learning remained stagnant. Of particular note was her continued scepticism towards TBLT. Her score on the TBLT Disposition Scale dropped one point from 69 to 68. Moreover, she remained apprehensive about her ability to utilize the model. "*Thinking the tasks might be difficult. Normally I'm not too bad at stuff like that but I think you really have to know where your students are to create a task that they will be receptive to*." In addition to questioning her ability to use TBLT she also expressed reservations over the pedagogical value of it. "*I thought the TBLT was pretty difficult . . . and I think that might frustrate kids*." She further explained: "*I guess if you are just doing one per lesson then it would have to be a little bit bigger because if we are focusing on form at the end it seems like to me I got the impression that it was, you know, a ten, fifteen minute thing at the end. And maybe it doesn't provide enough reinforcement on I don't know or practice*." In this statement Catriona revealed her perspective that language learning requires repeated reinforcement and repetition through practice activities. It did not occur to her that repeated exposure and usage could be fostered through tasks themselves rather than through an explicit analysis of forms. Therefore, the absence of a structure that focuses on grammar limited the perceived value of TBLT.

The Story of Deidra

Deidra's second language learning experiences began when she was eleven years old and her parents sent her to Ethiopia for a year to live with her grandparents. In addition to re-establishing ties with her relatives, Deidra attended a language school where she studied Amharic. When she arrived in Ethiopia Deidra possessed a minimal understanding of the language and could not speak or write. The beginner's course she attended was designed for individuals with no Amharic background and, therefore, instruction began with an introduction to the alphabet. After mastering the alphabet students were introduced to new concepts in a very structured and gradual manner. Deidra wrote: "*After learning the alphabet, I studied very basic grammar and forming simple sentences. Then, after mastering that, pictures were presented with questions such as, 'what is the color of the boy's shirt?' or 'what is the girl doing?' After that the teacher would gradually take things one step at a time.*" Instruction was exclusively done in the target language and the development of all four skills (reading, writing, listening and speaking) was emphasized. Deidra portrayed her teacher as a very kind, empathetic woman who was always very encouraging of students and only corrected major errors so as not to discourage them.

Deidra appreciated the structured approach to teaching utilized at the school but thought that the teacher-centered instruction inhibited language development. "*I believe that the aspect of the course that could have been improved is the activities. There were not enough group activities and pair work promoted, and I strongly believe that that aspect is needed to improve social interaction with others and oral skills.*" Deidra claimed that the year spent in Ethiopia helped her to become a proficient user of Amharic; however, she recognized that her specific context was largely responsible for her success. "*I was in a setting where the majority of the people spoke Amharic so I had to learn it and I was interested in it although it is very difficult to learn. . . Most of the people, like if I had to go to the store or anything like that, I mean they don't understand English so I had to try to communicate to them in Amharic.*" The motivation to learn her ancestral language and the constant exposure to input and opportunities for language production greatly enhanced her ability to learn the language outside of the classroom. Recognizing this, Deidra wasn't convinced that the instruction she had received was the most effective way to teach a language. Nonetheless, she had no other model of instruction from which to compare her Amharic lessons and they remained influential as she embarked on her journey to becoming a certified teacher.

In her analysis of various lessons Deidra demonstrated a strong preference for a grammatically based deductive approach to instruction, which enabled students to be actively engaged in using the language. In commenting on the PPP lesson she noted that the detailed explanation and multiple examples provided were useful in promoting language learning. Similar sentiments were expressed about the ESA lesson: "*I find the entire lesson appealing because the grammar lesson is still present, the students are working together, both the teacher and students are gaining cultural knowledge and everyone (most likely) is enjoying themselves*." As highlighted by the second part of this statement, the primary difference she identified between the two lessons was that the ESA lesson provided numerous opportunities for practicing the language while working with other students. The PPP lesson, on the other hand, only offered students one opportunity to use language with their peers and was deemed relatively boring as a result. Moreover, the absence of additional practice activities was viewed as potentially undermining the value of the explicit analysis. "*The lesson can be effective to some degree in promoting second language learning, but being drilled with grammar without having the students engaging in an abundant amount of activities is not entirely useful*." In this analysis Deidra revealed that explicit grammar instruction is important to her; however, it must be followed by engaging activities that allow language to be used.

While Deidra demonstrated a preference for a deductive approach to instruction she also revealed that she was more comfortable when grammar is the driving force behind a lesson. As mentioned previously Deidra was a proponent of the grammatical focus of the PPP and ESA lessons. She appreciated the way the grammatical concepts were introduced and felt that numerous activities to reinforce the concepts would lead to substantial language learning. In contrast, she demonstrated confusion over the inclusion of a focus on form phase at the conclusion of the task-based language teaching cycle. "*The aspect of the lesson that I dislike is that the teacher includes a grammar lesson. A grammar lesson should be incorporated, but just not maybe in this particular lesson because this lesson includes oral communication, analysis, and critical thinking. The grammar lesson should be left for a different lesson.*" Although she believed strongly in the importance of teaching grammar, including grammar instruction at the conclusion of the lesson based on the needs demonstrated by students seemed counter-intuitive.

Deidra's apprehension about the TBLT lesson was elaborated in her explanation about how easy it would be for a teacher to use. Whereas both the ESA and PPP lessons were deemed as easy to use and fun depending on the knowledge base of the teacher, the TBLT lesson was viewed less positively. "*This lesson may need a bit of time to plan out, but if everything goes according to plan, it should be okay.*" In addition to identifying the potentially difficult nature of planning TBLT lessons, Deidra also expressed reservations over the model as a risky undertaking. The use of the conditional clause to describe the outcome of the lesson demonstrated a strong degree of uncertainty. Although the lesson may be effective, it was dependent on numerous variables. First, the lesson may not proceed as expected, thus diminishing the influence of the teacher. Furthermore, even if the lesson did proceed as planned, Deidra was unsure whether it would lead to significant learning.

Uncertainty also characterized Deidra's view of TBLT based on the results of her language pedagogy beliefs scale. On the TBLT Disposition Scale Deidra scored 65. This result is slightly below the class average and demonstrates that she was unlikely to use the model. As demonstrated by her analysis of various lessons, Deidra believed in teacher-directed instruction that focused on grammar and promoted learning through repetitive practice exercises. These views were reinforced in her response to the statements provided on the scale (see Appendix I). It is noteworthy that she disagreed with statement #5, 'grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.' Based on her lack of agreement that fluency is the main focus of language instruction, one may conclude that she believed both are important, meaning neither should be viewed exclusively as the goal. Moreover, she only responded neutral/uncertain to five statements. This means that she generally committed herself to a particular position but was not confident enough about her stance to express strong commitment for it. This may be a result of her lack of experience analyzing the teaching-learning process from a teacher's perspective.

When Deidra entered into the third year course she had had only minimal experience in a second language classroom, all as a student. Nonetheless, she seemed to possess a passion for language teaching that translated into a real enthusiasm for learning. Deidra demonstrated an interest in the technical elements of language teaching. She enjoyed learning about various instructional models and found the workshops about lesson planning to be very useful. "*I found it very useful, for example the ESL class because the best thing I felt were the lesson plans honestly, because if I ever went to a class without a lesson plan I would be lost . . . It just gives me a focus, it organizes everything. When I have my outcomes on my lesson plan and what my objectives are and I write these on the board for the class to see, I feel like the class just runs smoothly.*" In addition to finding the workshops about lesson planning useful, she also expressed that the course gave her insights into how students learn languages. "*Especially from [the] class the learning strategies, the learning styles I found that very useful. Yeah I really, I honestly, honestly found [the] class very useful especially like I said with the lesson planning, with the theories and especially I loved Bloom's Taxonomy.*" She found that the theories introduced in the class helped explicate elements of the teaching-learning process that she could practically apply to her classroom.

The introduction of theoretical concepts and various ways of approaching teaching had an influence on Deidra's development as a teacher. Whereas she was only familiar with one style of teaching prior to studying at the university, the methods course helped to expand her view of how teaching may take place. This influenced her beliefs about language teaching. She wrote: "*At first, I did not know the importance of integrating functions and even grammatical concepts into courses. It is significant for students to learn functions and apply it to their daily lives. Also, grammatical concepts should be introduced by consciousness-raising activities and not practice, because practice does not make perfect and does not guarantee that the students will apply it to their speech.*" Her perspective on grammar changed considerably from the beginning of the class when she viewed grammar as an integral part of the language classroom. Recognizing second language acquisition research that questions the validity of the practice makes perfect assumption underlying her early learning experiences, Deidra advocated the use of what Ellis (1997) labelled consciousness-raising activities, activities that promote the analysis of grammatical concepts without requiring their utilization. This marked a significant change from the grammar-based instruction she favoured at the beginning of the course.

The change in her view of grammar carried over into her assessment of TBLT and PPP. Whereas she had applauded the structured, explicit presentation of grammar in PPP prior to the class, subsequent to the class she stated: "*I think it [PPP] is more grammar based and I don't really believe in teaching them so much grammar*." Consequently she expressed strong appeal for TBLT. "*My favourite one is actually the TBLT lesson plan because I believe in, I like the idea of using tasks instead of activities*." She continued: "*I like TBLT because the students can work individually and they can work in groups but I like the idea of . . . they can be creative I believe in a TBLT lesson and I, I just think that this is where they can mostly put their background knowledge to use*." The fact that TBLT was not so heavily dependent on grammar instruction and allowed students to draw on their previous knowledge made it appealing for her.

Although she was quite receptive to the new information presented to her at university, Deidra still held fast to some of her earlier beliefs about foreign language teaching. She wrote: "*What I have not changed my belief in is that the teacher should help his/her students develop strategies for improving their learning, let the students* *scaffold one another, use activities and tasks related to the students' interests and needs, and incorporate multiculturalism in the classroom.*" The importance of engaging students in the learning process, which was strongly encouraged in the class, remained a priority for her.

When Deidra began the five-week practicum her perspective on second language teaching had changed significantly from when she had enrolled in the methods course. The various theories and approaches to language teaching introduced in the class expanded her understanding about second language pedagogy and provided her with a diverse arsenal of techniques with which to teach students. How would the practicum influence her development as a teacher? Would the changes made during the class be maintained or would she have to re-evaluate her beliefs based on her first experience as a teacher?

Deidra was placed in a school with a special ESL program. She was assigned to an experienced mentor teacher whose responsibilities were split between teaching ESL and acting as the department head. Due to her administrative duties, the mentor teacher was not able to provide Deidra with enough hours of instruction to meet the minimum requirements of the practicum. As a result, Deidra was assigned to the classroom of a first-year teacher, with the head of the department still acting as her official mentor. Despite the title, the head of the department rarely engaged in the tasks normally associated with a mentor teacher and only occasionally interacted with Deidra.

In the new classroom Deidra was joined by another student teacher who had ESL as her minor. Although the presence of another student teacher limited the number of opportunities she had to individually instruct the class, Deidra deemed the arrangement to be very beneficial as they were able to support each other. She explained that the other student teacher helped her by discussing common issues they had and intervening when management issues arose. "*Well I talked to my partner [the second student teacher] about it and she felt exactly the same thing with exactly the same student. So when she noticed, when she would see that [an issue] . . . she would come up and she would kind of like intervene . . . And after that they would just be quiet. So and when she was in the same situation I would do the same thing. So we just sort of helped each other out.*" The fact that the two student teachers were able to collaborate in managing the behaviour in the class meant that the principle instructor could concentrate more on the delivery of the lesson and the development of her instructional skills. Moreover, the opportunity to discuss common issues and brainstorm potential solutions enabled the student teachers to utilize strategies they may otherwise have not thought about.

With the aid of the second student teacher assigned to the class, Deidra taught science and English. The first year teacher who regularly taught the class did not have any ESL training nor did she have a background in science. As a result, the two student teachers were asked to teach ESL science from the beginning of the practicum and were only allowed to gradually gain experience teaching English to the ESL students as the practicum proceeded.

Deidra described the first year teacher, who for all practical purposes became her mentor teacher, as unprepared and non-strategic in her approach to teaching. Deidra stated that the teacher would often throw lessons together at the last minute, thus creating a heavy reliance on the textbook and the use of worksheets. "*She had a bunch* *of books left over from last year that someone just left in the classroom, ESL books. So what she would do in the morning is just go and photocopy what she thought was good for the day's lesson and just run around getting things ready, whether for English or math or science. Everything was practically photocopied out of a book and the kids would work on it.*" The teacher was aware of her deficiencies and according to Deidra regularly stated that she was a poor role model and needed to become more like the student teachers.

Deidra's experiences in this setting were rewarding but also very difficult. Her practicum was characterized by a struggle to mediate contradictory influences. At the heart of this struggle was the reconciliation of her dual identity as a student and a teacher and all the inherent difficulties created by this paradoxical position. As is typical for many student teachers, Deidra found it difficult to gain students' respect as an authority figure. Her status as a student teacher and her youthful appearance created a perception among students that she was one of their peers. As a result, she was not treated with the same respect as other teachers. "*Because I am young the students kept trying to treat me like I was another fellow student or a classmate and they kept, you know, a lot respected me and a lot, it wasn't that they didn't respect me but they just didn't view me like my mentor teacher. My mentor teacher was older so they thought of her like she is the teacher, but when I went up there they were like, oh she is just helping the teacher. Like they didn't really think that I am being serious.*" Treatment as a peer and not as a teacher was not restricted to the instructional setting. Deidra was approached by several students in an inappropriate manner that made her feel very uncomfortable. "*I have had some students ask me for my e-mail address, ask me* *certain like specific questions just about my personal life and that they wanted like buy me gifts and stuff. And I felt really, really uncomfortable.*" The situation was further complicated by the inability of the mentor teacher to recognize the behaviour of the students as inappropriate and compromising of Deidra's ability to effectively teach the class. Deidra stated: "*But when I used to tell my mentor teacher she would just laugh and say oh it's not a problem, he's just joking.*" Hence, Deidra was not afforded the respect normally garnered by a teacher from certain students in the class, nor was her status as a professional recognized by the mentor teacher based on her flippant disregard for Deidra's concerns. Collegial support in dealing with student disciplinary issues is a hallmark of school culture. To ignore the disrespectful behaviour of the students and disregard it as anything but a playful gesture was sending the clear message that Deidra was not a legitimate teacher.

The struggle to be recognized as a teacher was not restricted to the classroom. Deidra revealed with great frustration that numerous staff members didn't treat her and the other student teacher with collegial respect. "*I felt like some treated us like we were even below students, if that is even possible. And I mean we were allowed access to the office and anything like that but every time we went in, my partner and I, maybe because we looked young and we looked like students they just would treat us kind of in a way, not disrespectful but kind of hostile and like 'sorry but you are not allowed to be here'. . . Even though we had our tag and everything but I mean and they've seen us like more than once in the office.*" The effort to be viewed as a professional was further undermined by the perception several teachers had that the student teachers were there to lessen their workload by completing menial tasks. Rather than engaging the student teachers in pedagogically meaningful tasks such as observing lessons or working with small groups of students, student teachers were asked on several occasions to decorate bulletin boards and set up chairs for meetings. "*If my, the first year teacher didn't need us in the class she would tell us 'you know you can go and fix the display case for the yearbook club.' So that was volunteer work, I mean so that was all written on my evaluation and I just did a whole bunch of other things*." Although she labelled the work as voluntary and recognized it would contribute to her final evaluation, Deidra felt pressured to comply and viewed the teachers' actions as unprofessional. "*I mean I love doing the volunteer work and it was good for me, a good experience for me and it went on my evaluation but I just felt like the way sometimes they acted when we were around, like you know throw everything on the student teachers and we can do whatever we want. I felt like that was really unprofessional*." Moreover, it was yet another example of a challenge to her legitimacy as a teacher. The students did not treat her as a teacher because of her youthful appearance and inexperience as a teacher. Similarly, staff at the school did not treat her in a collegial manner, further destabilizing her identity as a teacher.

While Deidra wasn't treated as a teacher, she also wasn't afforded the support typically given to a student. The head of the ESL department, who had originally been assigned as Deidra's mentor teacher, was a veteran teacher with a wealth of experience. Her experience and subject specific knowledge would have been an excellent resource in supporting Deidra's professional development. However, she was occupied with her duties as the department head and school counselor, limiting the time she had available to work with student teachers. Furthermore, Deidra expressed that the teacher was very defensive when interacting with the student teachers and didn't present herself as someone who could be easily approached for help. She stated: "*When we were asking certain questions about like the curriculum and about ESL and just certain things I felt like she would stop for a few seconds and look at us and be like, 'why are these students like maybe questioning my authority?' And we weren't, we honestly weren't. We were just asking innocent questions about the curriculum for example and she'd like be looking at us like in a hostile way and she'd just fire out these answers and then I just felt like, 'oh I can't ask her anything.'*" According to Deidra, the department head seemed to be intimidated by the student teachers and viewed their queries and fresh new ideas about language teaching as a threat to her established position. The defensive stance she took in response to the perceived threat created a barrier to collaboration with the student teachers. The result was the relative absence of the department head in the mentoring process.

The void left by the head of the department could only be filled by the regular classroom teacher. However, she did not have any training as an ESL instructor and was not in a position to provide guidance for the student teachers as she struggled with her own development as a teacher. Deidra stated: "*Because she hadn't been teaching science very well, because she mentioned that the first month was nothing of science and then she just taught a little about plants and life cycles and then we came in and we taught chemistry for four weeks and so she couldn't, she didn't really say anything about the way we were teaching science because she had nothing, she hadn't taught it before.*" In fact the teacher was very enthusiastic about acquiring the lesson plans designed by the student teachers, as they would assist her in instructing the class in the future. Unable to provide constructive feedback for the student teachers, the mentor teacher habitually praised their efforts. This created the perception that Deidra didn't need to develop her skill set in specific areas and promoted the maintenance of status quo practices.

Deidra's struggles in the classroom were not restricted to mediating her role as both a student and teacher; she also experienced difficulties in balancing between covering the material in the curriculum and individualizing instruction. Her mentor teacher was very concerned about content coverage and, therefore, pushed her to cover the material from the curriculum. Deidra felt that the material she was being asked to teach was above the students' level. "*Before we taught it [a lesson] the next day we would show it to her [the mentor teacher] and ask her if this is okay and she would tell us yes and she wanted us to like teach them everything there is to know about science and I'm like we can't really do that because it was so hard. Like the word molecule or matter they don't understand. She wanted us to teach them acids and bases and like just really difficult stuff for them at that level.*" Pressure to cover the curriculum was further complicated when Deidra became more familiar with the class and the personal issues that students faced. "*Some of them wanted to sleep. A lot of them have personal problems so you know you can't always tell them you know focus, I need you to listen because sometimes they just don't want to. And then everyone just stops listening to you and focuses on the one person who has an issue right then and there.*" Unsure of how to deal with the situation she consulted with her mentor teacher. "*When I asked my mentor teacher she said that a lot of the students in ESL have a lot of personal problems and issues, family problems, a lot of things going on in their lives. So you just have to* *go with the flow*." The contradictory messages provided to Deidra demanded that she cover the material while still going with the flow of the classroom. She was thus forced to charter a route that would enable her to balance the incongruous demands.

Faced by contradictory demands and the struggle to gain recognition as a teacher without collegial support, Deidra resorted to the style of teaching she had been most familiar with during her formative years. Although she had expressed a strong preference for TBLT subsequent to the methods class, it had no influence on her practices in the classroom. Deidra's science lessons were content-based with some activities incorporated to lessen the linguistic burden on students. In contrast, her English lessons followed a PPP sequence with a heavy focus on reading and activities to engage students in the lesson. She described her lesson structure as follows: "*So I would start off with ten minutes of silent reading and then maybe a lesson and then questions, lots of discussions, activities*." She further commented: "*Sometimes we would start off the lesson by just talking about a particular topic and then maybe studying it. And then maybe we might have an activity or something*." Each of the lessons she designed were teacher-directed and based on mastering particular structures that had been introduced in the class. Deidra expressed a strong preference for instruction that included a definitive presentation and a clear outcome. She commented: "*I liked the PPP. I liked using it. Isn't it presenting the lesson? That's great with ESL, always telling them you know what you are going to do. That's great with them*." This sentiment was in marked contrast to her espoused beliefs at the end of the class and it represented a shift in her attitude towards the structure of a lesson. Whereas previously she expressed comfort in allowing students to dictate the direction of her lessons, she demonstrated a strong preference for a well-planned structured lesson after the practicum.

Deidra's support for a very structured, teacher-directed lesson was based on her belief in its pedagogical soundness. She claimed that the presentation in a lesson sets the tone and direction for the class and helps students achieve the objectives. In the following excerpt Deidra also demonstrated that she believed a structured presentation would reduce the anxiety of students and promote interest in the lesson. "*I felt like if we did a review and we presented how to write a poem in front of them, they wouldn't be afraid of expressing their own ideas. We tried to make it seem like we were struggling a little bit with the words so they wouldn't feel shy or they wouldn't feel embarrassed that they didn't know what to write about. So then after that we got a few students writing about love and relationships . . . I felt like when we did one as a class it promoted like their interest more.*" It was interesting that she highlighted the reduction of anxiety for students because PPP obviously also reduced her stress in delivering a lesson. In the particular lesson described above, Deidra and her partner acted as though they were making up an example poem on the spot, whereas in reality it had been carefully scripted the night before. Having a well-planned and structured lesson enabled them to maintain control over the lesson and reduce the anxiety of the unknown. This was of grave importance for Deidra when evaluating her lessons also. Deidra ascribed success to a lesson based on how closely it followed her plan. "*Another success was after teaching a lesson I felt it went relatively well, most of the time it went according to how I had planned it and I felt like that was a success.*"

Deidra's preference for a structured, teacher-led approach to instruction was reinforced by her score on the TBLT Disposition Scale. Prior to the class she had scored 65, a score that indicated the unlikely use of the model. Despite expressing strong support for TBLT after the methods class, her score on the scale subsequent to the practicum remained stagnant – 66. The practical experiences she had at the school caused her to revert back to the beliefs she had held prior to entering the third year of her post-secondary program. Other than a stronger belief in the importance of a well-planned, well-structured lesson, her beliefs did not undergo any significant change during the course of the semester.

Interestingly, her experiences in the classroom helped to further reinforce certain beliefs she held about language teaching. The ineffectiveness of repeated error correction was demonstrated through her engagement with students in the classroom. "*I believe that the students do come with a certain amount of background knowledge and experience that does affect second language teaching. Also, not correcting every single grammar mistake they make because even though your correct them, they are not going to put that to use. They maybe say it in front of you but the minute you turn your back they might repeat their mistakes again.*" This belief originated during her language learning experiences, was supported by SLA research presented at the university and further solidified through her interactions with students.

The Story of Elisabeth

Elisabeth's development as an educator was heavily influenced by her experiences prior to entering into the third year of her Education degree. As a first generation Canadian, Elisabeth was enrolled in a Japanese immersion program by her parents to provide a link between her Canadian upbringing and her ancestral roots. The immersion program was inevitably staffed by native-speakers who had immigrated to Canada after spending their formative years in Japan. This provided students with a model for the correct use of the target language and a sense of coherence for parents that their children would be educated in a manner that they could relate to. Elisabeth described the structure of her Japanese lessons as follows: "*Each lesson had new definitions. So the teacher would put the new words on the board and explain what the meaning is and give examples of how it is used in a sentence. Then the new words will be assigned as homework for practice. Then we would actually go through the reading with the new words and learn the lesson. At the end of the unit we will have a 'spelling test'*." Elisabeth explicated that the 'lesson' portion of the class occurring after the reading often consisted of completing exercises from the textbook or engaging in teacher-directed discussions. The rigid, vocabulary-based approach to teaching provided Elisabeth with a singular model of how second languages are taught and learned. Based on her own success in learning Japanese, Elisabeth applauded the approach utilized by her immersion teachers, in particular for its focus on the contextual development of vocabulary and the provision of a native-speaker model for target language usage. Her only criticism of the instruction she received was the absence of opportunities to engage in dialogue with additional native-speakers outside of the classroom teacher.

Unlike most education students who enter into the third year of their degree with limited or no experience teaching a second language, Elisabeth had a wealth of experience. While studying in Canada she acted as a volunteer Japanese teacher for young children. This enabled her to experience classroom dynamics from an alternative perspective and to begin to formulate her identity as a teacher. After two years at the university she interrupted her academic career to develop her Japanese linguistic abilities and to gain experience as an English tutor. Although she initially struggled to gain employment because of her Japanese appearance, Elisabeth was able to acquire a job as a private tutor in her family's native land. In this role she became acutely aware of her deficiencies as an English teacher. "*I was prepping this one student for his TOEFL and I was doing these exercises with him and they were hard. Like some of them he would ask me why and I was like, oh, I don't know why*." Unable to provide grammatical expertise for students, Elisabeth sought to draw on her native pronunciation and conversation skills as a commodity to justify her employment. Well-positioned Japanese students have several tutors who consecutively work with them in the evening, thus creating a condition of competition between tutors, in particular for a beginning teacher with a developing sense of efficacy. "*How am I going to be special quote unquote for them to be awake at six o'clock at night when they have had two other tutors prior to that? So I just did fifty minutes of, you know, just chit chat, get to know each other*."

After returning to Canada and reflecting upon her experiences in Japan, Elisabeth lamented that her approach to teaching had not been very relevant for her students. "*It was hard for the students I taught in Japan because they didn't see it as being relevant because they don't speak English outside of the school or outside of the house*." Her notion of relevance was not limited to the pragmatic quality of her instruction but also the ability of instruction to promote interest in the content and motivate students to want to learn. "*Relevance is the key really . . . especially for adolescents. . . I was thinking school is school, whether it is relevant or not. Like that's the way I was taught right, so you have just got to learn it. But at the same time there's no point in creating a lesson that is not relevant to their lives*." Despite the emphasis on learning for learning sake experienced during her youth, Elisabeth's experiences as a teacher gave her insight into the importance of tapping into students' intrinsic motivation. For this developing teacher, effective language instruction involved the provision of language learning experiences that would also be inherently interesting.

The importance of presenting lessons that are relevant and interesting for students was reinforced in Elisabeth's lesson analyses completed at the beginning of the course. She strongly favoured the ESA lesson based on its ease of use for the teacher and its appeal to students. "*This lesson plan allows the majority of students to connect to the topic and have an interest in it. Whether the song is of their liking or not, students are forced to listen carefully to see what the Barenaked Ladies are singing about. By tying together the song and the grammatical theory, students may not focus too much on the grammar lesson because they keep hearing the song in their head, thus memorizing the sentence (chorus) unknowingly*." The use of contemporary music that students may be familiar with or may find appealing was heralded by Elisabeth as important in promoting interest in the lesson. In her explication, Elisabeth also revealed the belief that although grammatical instruction was important it should not be the main focus of lessons. On the contrary, grammar should be incorporated into activities with a communicative focus. This is corroborated by the language belief scale in which she disagreed with the statement, 'grammatical correctness is the most important criteria by which language performance should be judged,' and agreed with the statement, 'the main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently' (see Appendix J).

While the ESA lesson was identified as the most appealing, Elisabeth was also attracted to certain elements of the PPP lesson description. First and foremost she identified the model as being very user friendly. After presenting material to students, the teacher was free to supervise her pupils as they completed their work. This meant that planning was very structured and the onus for learning was placed squarely on the student. Elisabeth wrote: "*Most of the work is done by the students themselves. Teachers are just there to guide and assist them and allow them to apply the concepts.*" The repetitive use of concepts introduced in class through numerous drills and practice activities also appealed to her. She explained that the independent application of concepts through practice activities enabled students to test their language hypotheses, thus leading to the development of their interlanguage system. The importance of repetitive practice was reflected in her disagreement that 'exercises/drills are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life skills.'

Although the PPP and ESA lessons were identified as possessing numerous positive characteristics, the TBLT lesson was reviewed with less enthusiasm. The lesson was identified as providing a significant opportunity for meaningful communication. Nonetheless, Elisabeth believed that the lesson would be a risky undertaking for teachers because it was heavily dependent on students for its success. "*This plan can be successful for the teacher if the students were well informed of the situations and willing to discuss the topic. But if the students weren't knowledgeable in* *this topic discussing it may cause a few problems. Thus this can only work when the teacher knows their class . . . Depending on the class, this [lesson] may either go really well or bomb.*" The perceived inability of the teacher to control the success of the lesson made TBLT a tenuous undertaking. Furthermore, Elisabeth perceptively stated: "*Because of cultural background or the feeling of being accepted some high school students may not want to voice their opinions to avoid conflict.*" The difficulty in identifying appropriate topics on which to base TBLT lessons also rendered the model less desirable.

While Elisabeth overtly expressed reservations over the utilization of TBLT, her score on the TBLT Disposition Scale also revealed that she was unlikely to implement it in a class. Compared to the mean score of 67 achieved by her colleagues, Elisabeth scored 57 on the scale. Of greatest consequence was her perspective on the role of the teacher in the classroom. Whereas a task-based language teacher must assume the non-traditional role of facilitator and guide, Elisabeth expressed the belief that a teacher should play a more direct role in instruction. Her experiences in a structured, teacher-centered classroom influenced her understanding of the role of a teacher. This understanding was premised on the belief that the teacher should be actively engaged in determining the direction of the lesson, thus mitigating her willingness to adopt approaches or models of instruction that called for an alternative role to be assumed.

When Elisabeth entered into the course she expressed non-determinant beliefs about language teaching (see Appendix J). Out of 26 statements she answered neutral/uncertain to half. Of the remaining 13 statements only one was identified as strongly disagree and one as strongly agree. The absence of a strong commitment to particular beliefs may be interpreted in a number of ways. First, she may not have understood several of the statements and used the 'uncertain' answer to demonstrate a lack of comprehension. Second, she may have lacked confidence in her knowledge of second language teaching and learning and, therefore, avoided strong statements to 'hedge her bets' in an attempt to avoid being perceived as lacking in knowledge or being wrong. Third, she may have been indifferent to most of the statements, demonstrating a very malleable perspective towards language teaching. Based on her extensive experiences as a language learner and teacher it is unlikely that comprehension and confidence were issues. Therefore, a fair assumption would be that the third option was applicable and she would be a prime candidate to be influenced by the presentation of new material during the course.

Although this might appear to be a fair assumption, the data collected from Elisabeth subsequent to the class revealed that the course had little influence on her development as a professional educator. Prior to enrolling in the course Elisabeth favoured an approach to instruction that assigned a prominent role to the teacher and focused on the development of students' vocabulary. She also strongly favoured instruction that was relevant and interesting for students. Although these beliefs about foreign language teaching did not change as a result of the class, her understanding about relevant instruction evolved into a more sophisticated form. Based on her concept map of effective ESL teaching, Elisabeth demonstrated a more elaborate conception of the variables that contributed to relevancy. In addition to considering the pragmatic usage of language and the ability of instruction to attract students' interest, Elisabeth exhibited greater awareness about contextual factors influencing the relevancy of educational practices. The cultural background and previous educational experiences of students were identified as important considerations when designing lessons. "*When developing a lesson plan the teacher must consider the background of each student. . . It is critical for the teacher to consider the diversity in his or her classroom and design a lesson plan that gives each student an equal opportunity to benefit.*" In this statement Elisabeth revealed an awareness of historical and cultural influences on the teaching-learning process and the need to make instruction relevant according to an individual's personal history. Moreover, she demonstrated an expanded view of the teacher as possessing an ethical obligation to adjust instruction based on the specific population being taught. This was reinforced by the following statement: "*The teacher must recognize that students are unique in their own way, inside and outside of the classroom. By familiarizing himself/herself to the different kinds of learners, the teacher becomes more flexible in his/her teaching and is able to accommodate for each student. Sometimes even the students don't know what type of learning is best for them, and as a teacher he/she is there to guide them in order to succeed.*" It is interesting in this explanation that Elisabeth recognized the professionalism of teachers, as possessing theoretical knowledge beyond the layperson that would enable them to make informed instructional decisions.

Despite the maturation and increased sophistication of her perspective on second language teaching and learning, the beliefs Elisabeth held when entering into the class were resilient. She stated: "*I don't think my beliefs really changed to tell you the truth. Just because I just came back from teaching ESL and I learned through that and I didn't make too many mistakes fortunately.*" From her perspective teaching is an endeavour that may be judged in terms of right or wrong. The teaching approach utilized by the teacher was either successful or may be construed as a mistake. Furthermore, this perspective upholds failure in a practical setting as a prerequisite to the re-evaluation and reformulation of teaching practices. The question that arises from this is how will the five-week teaching practicum influence her development as an educator? More specifically, will the concepts introduced in the class emerge when difficulties are encountered while teaching?

Due to the absence of sufficient numbers of ESL placements in the area surrounding the university, Elisabeth was placed in a Japanese classroom. Her mentor teacher was born and raised in Japan and spoke Japanese as his native language. He had been teaching Japanese in the school for numerous years and had played a prominent role in the development of the Provincial Japanese Curriculum. Elisabeth explained that he had a very deep understanding about the Japanese language and culture and that she had learned quite a bit through observing his lessons.

Elisabeth's mentor teacher and the other staff members at the school were very supportive of her during the practicum. She did not feel any pressure to conform to a particular way of teaching and, quite to the contrary, felt encouraged to experiment by the regular teachers at the school. "*It was quite free . . . because I bounced some ideas off of some of them [language teachers at the school] and they thought, oh give it a try, this is the time to do it. Like they were supportive about that. If I made a mistake they were fine with that, they just said, you know, this is the time to try it.*" The feeling of security to experiment with new ways of teaching was enhanced by her status as a student teacher. "*I wasn't afraid I would get fired or something, which is always I think* *a lot of people's agony – I don't want to make any mistakes or whatever. I find, I think that is really sad. And I might, you never know, I might have to go through that. I think everyone probably would. But at the same time right now it's the time to [experiment], because I can't get fired.*" Under the protective shield of not having a teaching certificate and working under a mentor teacher, Elisabeth felt secure to take risks. She didn't perceive the final evaluation for the practicum to carry the same consequences as a teacher's performance assessment and, therefore, felt liberated to teach as she pleased.

Staff support and the security of not having to worry about being fired did not result in significant experimentation. Elisabeth's lesson plans were organized in a similar manner to the way she had been taught – the introduction of vocabulary followed by a series of exercises, culminating with an oral presentation. The focus of the content remained the same and the role of the teacher in presenting material and providing opportunities for mastery learning mimicked that of the teachers she had been exposed to during her apprenticeship of observation. Nonetheless, she perceived that she was engaged in experimentation because of minor adaptations made to the familiar formula of instruction. "*Well I did the . . . self-correction thing where the students took turns reading the new vocabulary out loud. So the students will read and then the class will read after them, repeat it after them. So if he or she made a mistake they'll hear the class say it properly and then they will correct themselves the second time. I find that more effective than me saying not this way, not that way. I have done it a couple times, I have experimented a lot. I tried telling the student to repeat after me and then they'll repeat it wrong and I'll correct them but they still make the same mistake.*" Altering the manner in which she facilitated error correction in an attempt to find a preferred method was deemed as safe experimentation because it didn't significantly modify the structure of her teaching, enabling her to remain within her comfort zone. Similarly, Elisabeth experimented with the methods used to correct exercises and the length of instruction or activity segments used in a lesson. However, these changes also didn't represent a significant change from the teaching approach she was most familiar with. Therefore, new ways of engaging in pedagogical activities were only considered if they did not drastically waver from the familiar.

Elisabeth's reluctance to experiment with significantly different approaches to teaching was due to numerous factors. First, her confidence as a novice teacher was a serious impediment. "*I've always had this attitude that you know I feel I am not that much more mature than some high school kids. So I am not, psychologically I am not at a level where I can be someone who can guide them in anything . . . I was really nervous because I was afraid the students wouldn't see me as a teacher just because I didn't have the confidence really to say 'I am your teacher' because I don't feel that I am ready for that.*" Lacking confidence in her new role as a teacher, Elisabeth reverted to practices that were familiar and allowed her to easily control the classroom environment. Thus she avoided discussions and group work involving more than pairs and reconfigured the classroom from desks placed in pods of four or eight into rows. Elisabeth's confidence in her abilities as a teacher increased as she gained experience and the students began to recognize her more as an authority figure. Nonetheless, classroom management was an issue that concerned her and caused her to seek the comfort of a structured classroom system that would enable her to maintain control. "*If it was my classroom it would be more structured, it would be like rules set up and you* *know it sounds so like, you know, teacher-like but at the same time like I think it would work better than that [the laissez faire approach adopted by the mentor teacher]. Right, so structure, the main word, structure. I think it works for both students and teachers because I thought maybe only the teacher likes structure but students I saw, it was evident to me that they too need structure or else they will get lost.*" Elisabeth's personal need for structure in the classroom was complemented by the perceived benefits accrued by the students when structure was created.

A second factor inhibiting experimentation was Elisabeth's desire to avoid conflict in the classroom. The novice teacher perceived five weeks to be too short a period of time to impose new routines on the classroom. "*I think once I get my own classroom or [feel] more comfortable with the students I would definitely take more risks and put them into groups and see, like test out my management skills on that. But at the moment, just because I was there for such a short time I didn't feel comfortable.*" She perceived a change in the regular routine of the classroom to have the potential of creating management issues that she was not yet comfortable dealing with. Moreover, she did not want to interrupt the regular pattern of instruction, fearing that it may interfere with the form of learning students were accustomed to and adversely influence the year plan set out by the teacher. She was particularly apprehensive about adjusting the teaching structure of the one class in which students were responsible for writing a standardized test at the end of the year. She feared that an adjustment in the pace and structure of the class may adversely affect students' acquisition of the content needed for writing the exam. The abbreviated length of the practicum and her desire to make things easier for the students and the mentor teacher meant that Elisabeth "*didn't want to be too intrusive.*"

The third and most important factor mitigating Elisabeth's tendency towards experimentation was her inability to visualize alternative forms of instruction. Through her years as a student and her early observations of her mentor teacher, Elisabeth had physically been exposed to only one structure of teaching. Although she had been introduced to task-based language teaching and a variety of other approaches to language instruction while studying at the university, she couldn't conceptualize how to bridge the gap between theory and practice and actually implement these approaches in her Japanese class. "*The way I see Japanese is there is a structure but at the same time it can't be that structured, like to follow a specific format. I don't know why, it's just the feeling I get. . . I am having a hard time just because I can do this [apply different models of instruction] in English when I teach English but in Japanese it's just for some reason really hard to structure it that way. I think also because of the way I was taught, it was never that structured. So I've never been exposed to such a structured format for teaching this language . . . So to try and practice it is a bit hard to tell you the truth because I have never seen it done before.*" The absence of a guiding model made straying away from the familiar incomprehensible. Therefore, TBLT and other models of instruction were not viewed as plausible options.

Elisabeth's reliance on familiarity was reflected in her post-practicum pedagogical belief scale results. Her score on the TBLT Disposition Scale remained identical to what it had been prior to entering into the class or embarking on the practicum – 57. This score reflected her continued preference for the familiar form of instruction she had grown up with. Nonetheless, minor alterations in her beliefs did take place over the course of the practicum. First, Elisabeth's understanding about the role of the teacher evolved. Whereas prior to the practicum she believed in a more direct role for the teacher, subsequent to the practicum she believed in a slightly less dominant role for the teacher. This was reflected in her neutral stance towards the teacher as imparter of knowledge (statement #19) and teacher as facilitator (statement #4). Although the teacher was viewed less as an imparter of knowledge, Elisabeth's belief in the certainty of language instruction leading to particular outcomes was strengthened during the teaching experience. This demonstrated that she perceived her instruction as having more of a direct relation to learning than before. Moreover, her belief in the benefits of group work changed significantly. Even though she wasn't certain about the role of the teacher as a facilitator or imparter of knowledge, she did believe that the teacher should be at the center of learning.

Elisabeth's view on the role of the student also changed moderately during the semester. She explained: "*The students help you write your next lesson right. If you don't give them the opportunity to do that then you are just stuck, like if you run out of ideas. I found that with a lot of the students they could just go if you give them the opportunity, a chance to express their, you know, knowledge about stuff like that. It takes you very far which is even better as opposed to just following the text.*" As demonstrated by this statement, Elisabeth was surprised by the amount of input that students provided for her planning. She found that the students were very perceptive in identifying activities that would address their needs and in helping her to plan future lessons. She also stated that the students in her class improved several of the activities she had planned for them by creatively altering the content of the exercise. Despite her strong statements about the influence that students have in the classroom, she found it difficult to move away from her view of students as passive recipients of knowledge. Her espoused belief about students' providing input into the teaching-learning process (statement #12) moved from disagree to neutral, while her stated belief about the negotiation of activities (statement #26) moved from neutral to agree. These modifications represent a modest change in her perception of the role students' play in the classroom.

While her perspective on the role of the teacher and student changed slightly, so did her beliefs about how languages are learned. Prior to taking the course Elisabeth had expressed a rather ambivalent view of language learning. She was non-committal about the need for explicit instruction and practice drills in language learning and expressed a moderate belief in the importance of error correction in language acquisition. However, at the conclusion of the practicum she articulated stronger views on explicit teaching leading to mastery learning. These adjustments in her beliefs demonstrated that the practicum led her to believe more strongly in the central characteristics of the PPP oriented instruction she had been accustomed to – mainly that accuracy will lead to fluency and practice makes perfect.

The relative stability of her beliefs was explained by Elisabeth as a by-product of her nature. She believed that she was a very flexible individual with elastic beliefs. "*My beliefs are very broad. That's why like when we went through stuff I just yeah, I thought of that too, yeah I thought of that too. Like I don't, my beliefs aren't so concrete. So which makes it, which I don't do on purpose, that's just how I am, like my* *characteristics. . . If I learn something that causes by beliefs to change, it wouldn't be far out just because it is so broad anyways right. So that's why I feel it didn't but I am sure it, what's the word, it sort of felt like it just kind of conditioned the beliefs to make them stronger as opposed to changing it completely. I just felt that it got stronger as opposed to learning something completely new*." This explanation would seem to make sense in light of the fact that she expressed such neutral beliefs about foreign language pedagogy. However, much of the empirical research presented in the methods course contradicted her espoused beliefs and the practices she followed in the classroom. Therefore, her beliefs shouldn't have been conditioned to become stronger but rather should have been weakened by dissenting information. The fact that this didn't occur supports the view espoused in belief literature that long-standing, entrenched beliefs act as a filter through which all new information is processed. Therefore, concepts that supported Elisabeth's view of language pedagogy would strengthen her beliefs, while contradictory concepts would be discarded or altered to reinforce beliefs that they actually undermine.

The ineffectiveness of the course to influence Elisabeth's development as a teacher may also be traced to her view of the relationship between theory and practice. When asked about the role of course work and practical experiences (IPT) in her development as a teacher, Elisabeth explained: "*I kind of see them as the same. IPT and classroom like comes in a pair to me. . . IPT in general was about connecting the theories and the actual practice. I don't know if that is the proper way to word it. But to connect it, to be able to practice what you preach type of thing*." From this perspective theory and practice are integrated and mutually dependent. However, Elisabeth admitted that her instructional decisions were instinctual and not based on theoretical foundations. "*While I was in the classroom I thought about what I learnt in my IPT, like my courses, but I'd still act the way I would want to act, do you know what I mean? Like the way I saw myself acting. How I picture myself acting as a teacher. I still did what I felt comfortable with at that time. So yeah, I didn't feel like when I was teaching I was like okay the rule said da da da da. Like I never felt that. I don't know it just came natural.*" Although she claimed to think about the pedagogical theories espoused at the university, they didn't contribute significantly to her actual practices. The natural, instinctual way she made instructional decisions was, therefore, based on the visual images of teaching she had accumulated over the years as a learner. Despite the fact that she recognized the influence of theory on practice, the absence of meaningful reflection resulted in the unconscious reproduction of traditional teaching practices.

CHAPTER SEVEN: DISCUSSION

Research Question One: How does a constructivist based approach to teacher education influence student teachers' professional development?

Each of the students participating in this study had a unique biography based on their experiences as language learners prior to entering into the teacher preparation program. The experiences of the students differed significantly in terms of the duration, context, and objectives of language learning. For some of the students, second language learning had been an integral part of their education from an early age. For others second language learning experiences were limited to a few years of study as an adult. Although each of the students had experience learning a language in both a naturalistic and formal learning setting, the influences of these experiences on students' linguistic development differed significantly. For example, Catriona was disappointed with her language learning experiences in Ukraine and attributed much of her linguistic development to the explicit grammar instruction received after returning to Canada. In contrast, Annika found that formal learning experiences had a nominal influence on her communicative capabilities. She attributed her success in acquiring Spanish to the time spent conversing with native speakers in Peru.

Although students enjoyed very different language learning experiences, one commonality was the type of formal instruction received. Each of the students' formal learning experiences was based on a product-view of language that promoted language acquisition through the presentation of particular lexical or structural items followed by opportunities to practice using the items. The "*implicit professional consensus*" (Brooke) established through the pervasive use of this approach provided students with a singular model to follow. This had a significant effect on the pre-service teachers' philosophy of second language teaching and learning. Overwhelmingly, the student teachers' expressed a preference for structured, teacher-centered instruction that focused around grammar. This was evident not only in the lesson analyses completed at the beginning of the course but also in the fact that only one of the five students scored above 59 on the TBLT Disposition Scale completed on the first day of classes.

Despite commonalities in student teachers' macro view of second language teaching and learning, each student possessed different notions about what was important in learning a second language. Deidra, for example, strongly believed in opportunities to use language to communicate with peers based on her experiences in Ethiopia. On the other hand, Catriona favoured repetitive drills due to the positive effect it had on her language development. For each of the students in the study the diverse experiences enjoyed as language learners contributed to their unique conceptions of second language pedagogy. The data thus reinforced the role of the apprenticeship of observation in the formation of teachers' early conceptions of second language pedagogy.

Beliefs established during the apprenticeship of observation are based on partial truths and incomplete knowledge about the teaching-learning process. Students' view of the work of teachers is limited to classroom episodes. Thus, learners' conceptions of teaching are simplified and reductive in nature. Moreover, drawing on Winitzky and Kauchuk's (1997) theory, many of the beliefs presented themselves as p-prims or abstractions that have not been well integrated or analyzed. It is not surprising then that many of the notions held by the pre-service teachers when they entered the program were not solidly grounded or integrated with other beliefs.

The constructivist-based approach adopted in the third year curriculum course forced students to explicitly state and analyze their philosophy of second language pedagogy in relation to new information presented in class. Data collected at the end of the semester demonstrated that the course had a significant effect on most of the pre-service teachers' understanding about the teaching-learning process in a second language classroom. In requiring students to explicitly state their philosophy, many tacit assumptions were revealed. If these assumptions were not well grounded in an individual's experiences or integrated with other knowledge, they were often exposed to scrutiny by alternative conceptions made apparent during the class. This was the case for a number of the students in relation to their attitude towards error correction, the role of drills in the classroom, and the importance of explicit grammar instruction. Most of the students intuitively supported these elements of language instruction because they had been prevalent in the methods they had been exposed to as learners. Nonetheless, the experiences of several students pointed toward the ineffectiveness of teacher-centered, behaviourist-based activities. Annika, for example, complained that such activities were responsible for her failure to develop communicative competence in German. Weak associations with particular concepts were thus exploited by promoting a form of personal inquiry. As a result, the course enacted a change in teachers' philosophies by challenging the foundation of existing beliefs and presenting alternatives.

In addition to challenging particular beliefs, the course also promoted a more sophisticated understanding about second language education. At the beginning of the course, the students generally possessed a very narrow view of language pedagogy that centered on teaching grammar and vocabulary. Analysis of their personal learning experiences and exposure to various SLA theories and language teaching approaches expanded their perspectives on the complexities of second language education. The concept maps completed at the end of the course demonstrated that pre-service teachers had developed a richer more textured understanding about the intricacies of the language classroom and the process of language learning. This was demonstrated by the fact that students' maps drew on elements of sociolinguistics, psycholinguistics, second language acquisition theory, and general educational theory.

It may be postulated that the development that took place during the course was a result of exposure to new information rather than the structure of the class itself. However, data from the study demonstrated that beliefs established during the curriculum course remained relatively constant even after the practicum. This demonstrates that the new knowledge developed was well integrated into their cognitive schemata. This would suggest that the use of current knowledge as the starting point to develop new understandings was an effective strategy.

Even though the course had a significant effect on the professional development of most of the students, Elisabeth was nominally affected by the experience. Beliefs established during her experiences learning and teaching a second language remained constant throughout the semester, although these conceptions were often elaborated upon as a result of concepts introduced in class. This may indicate that students with previous teaching experience are unlikely to be affected by course work. However, it is also likely that personal characteristics played a significant role. This would support Markee's (1997a) contention that some teachers are unlikely to change regardless of the efforts made by external agents of change.

Research Question Two: What influence does the course have on pre-service teachers' disposition towards and utilization of task-based language teaching?

A combined rational-empirical, normative re-educative strategy was adopted in the curriculum course to promote innovation. The rational appeal of task-based language teaching was promoted by introducing students to second language acquisition research and promoting discussion about social issues related to pedagogy. This approach was complemented by the general structure of the course that promoted personal inquiry into student teachers' professional identities and knowledge. Waters (2005) exclaimed that teacher education programs should be based on a normative re-educative approach that involves a two-way values clarification process. He wrote: "This is the case because what is involved is not only the attempt by the teacher educator to influence mastery by the teacher of a new technique, but, rather, the development of new attitudes and concepts" (Waters, 2005, p.219). Therefore, the focus of teacher education is not to promote a particular approach or technique, but rather to develop an inquisitive demeanour. This was the perspective adopted in the curriculum course. Although the bias of the instructor towards TBLT would have been apparent to students in the class, TBLT was never presented as the only viable or most desirable approach to teaching. In contrast, tasks were presented as one of many options for students to critically digest and analyze.

This leads to the question, how did the combined rational-empirical, normative re-educative approach influence student teachers' disposition towards TBLT? In order to answer this question it is important to clarify the parameters of the concept used in this context. Disposition is utilized here to note an individual's "attitudes, values and beliefs that influence the application and use of knowledge and skills" (Wilkerson & Lang, 2007, p.2). It should be noted that disposition is not linked to actual behaviours, just the tendency to demonstrate particular behaviours. In this way a disposition may be identified directly by the explicit expression of support or indirectly through beliefs that are coherent with particular behaviours.

On the first level, mixed results were achieved. Annika and Deidra expressed strong support for TBLT. They believed that TBLT provided the most potential for promoting an effective language learning environment and they expressed commitment to developing their skills to utilize the approach. Brooke and Catriona, on the other hand, acknowledged the benefits of TBLT but were skeptical about using it in the classroom. They noted that lessons could be derived from the approach that would influence their practices; however, they were apprehensive about its effectiveness in a typical classroom. Finally, Elisabeth was ambivalent to the approach. She had already established a rigid view of how language teaching should take place, which didn't allow for TBLT to be even considered.

On the second level, similar results were obtained. The beliefs of Elisabeth and Deidra, as represented on their pedagogical beliefs scale, were not significantly influenced by the course. As a result, their TBLT Disposition Scale scores remained constant. It is interesting to note that although Deidra's perspective on TBLT evolved considerably during the course, her score on the disposition scale did not. This could be attributed to her desire to appease the interviewer by presenting answers that she believed were sought after. However, this hypothesis was not corroborated by the fact that she attempted to use instruction based on the principles of TBLT during her practicum.

While Elisabeth and Deidra's TBLT Disposition Scale scores remained constant throughout the semester, the other students' results demonstrated significant increases. The scores achieved by Catriona and Brooke increased by at least ten points on the scale. This marked an increased score on the TDS of 26% and 35% respectively. These increases are substantial but pale in comparison with the change undertaken by Annika. At the beginning of the course Annika scored 55 on the TDS. This marked the third lowest score attained by any of the twelve students participating in the study. However, at the end of the semester Annika's beliefs had been totally overhauled, resulting in a TDS score of 86, an increase of 89% when a eighty-point scale is applied. When the TDS scores of the aforementioned five students are combined with the seven students whose data was not presented in the form of cases, the influence of the course becomes even more apparent (see Appendix L). On average students' score on the TDS increased by 7.3. This constitutes an average increase of 17%. Moreover, Deidra and Elisabeth were the only students whose TDS score remained constant and only one student experienced a decrease (Jacob). However, his TDS score remained very high at 81 at the conclusion of the class. When the qualitative data is combined with the quantitative data it is apparent that the class had a positive effect on student teachers' disposition towards the innovation on an explicit and implicit level.

Despite the influence of the course on the pre-service teachers' disposition towards TBLT, the approach was used sparingly during the practicum. Only Deidra and Annika experimented with task-based lessons, the other student teachers maintained teacher-centered practices that focused on particular teaching points. Annika utilized task-based lessons intermittently throughout her practicum and also adopted tasks as a means of assessment. Deidra, on the other hand, used lessons based on the principles of TBLT more sparingly and limited assessment to more traditional techniques.

Research Question Three: What factors influenced student teachers' instructional decisions during their five-week practicum?

The conceptions of second language pedagogy possessed by student teachers prior to entering into the teacher preparation program were challenged in the curriculum course, resulting in significant changes. Nonetheless, the instructional practices of the pre-service teachers closely mirrored those of teachers they had had as learners. The underlying reasons for instructional decisions were different for each of the student teachers. Nonetheless, certain themes emerged from the data.

First, pre-service teachers' instructional decisions were influenced by the resources available to them. The resources available in most classrooms in which student teachers completed their practicum were quite limited. In most cases a singular textbook was used as the overriding source of instruction. The textbooks were invariably structured around a concept of the day approach, which lends itself well to traditional PPP (presentation-practice-production) instruction. Therefore, to adopt a task-based approach to instruction would have required students to adapt the resources that were present in the class or find additional resources. Both endeavors require a significant time commitment, a luxury that most student teachers did not have. As is characteristic of many novice teachers, the workload in planning lessons was considerable for the students in the study. Even though the students only taught a portion of their mentor teachers' course load, they reported spending copious hours preparing for their lessons. The additional burden of finding or creating new materials, therefore, was not viable.

Second, student teachers' instructional practices were influenced by the classroom structures developed by their mentor teachers. The student teachers started their five-week practicum near the end of the semester. This meant that classroom routines and timelines for covering material had been firmly established. In some cases (Brooke and Catriona) mentor teachers dictated that particular instructional and management techniques be used in order to establish coherence. In these situations the student teachers had no choice but to mimic their mentor teachers. In other cases (Annika, Catriona, and Elisabeth) the student teachers were not required to follow prescribed practices but chose to do so. In these examples, student teachers were concerned with maintaining consistency with their mentor teachers. Student teachers feared that if they ventured away from habitual practices they would risk raising the ire of students.

Underlying student teachers' desire to maintain consistency with their mentor teachers was the motivation to receive a good evaluation. Student performance evaluations are based exclusively on the opinions of mentor teachers. Although facilitators from the university conduct observations and hold regular cohort meetings with students at the various schools, they are not directly involved in the assessment process. Moreover, the criteria set forth by the university for evaluating student teachers is very broad and does not include components that reward experimentation. As a result, evaluations are based on the subjective view of good teaching held by individual mentor teachers (Woodward, 1996). The student teachers in this study demonstrated keen awareness of this fact. As Catriona stated: "I did anything they wanted me to just because they say if I pass or fail." The student teachers were also cognizant of the implicit message sent when the practices of the mentor teacher were discarded in favour of other approaches. To avoid the risk of antagonizing one's mentor teacher or teaching in a manner that may not be appreciated, student teachers often closely adhered to the routines established by their mentor teachers.

Third, instructional decisions were motivated by the desire to cover prescribed material. Each of the student teachers was assigned particular content to teach during the practicum. The content was provided by mentor teachers with the explicit expectation that it would be covered before the conclusion of the five weeks. Student teachers, therefore, made decisions to ensure that adequate content was addressed during lessons. This meant relying heavily on didactic, transmission style instruction that allowed the teacher to maintain the perception of control over the learning process.

The fact that student teachers would adjust their instruction to ensure that prescribed content was covered would seem to be common sense; however, it points to an underlying issue in the utilization of TBLT. Transmission style instruction is premised on the notion that content is stable and the teaching-learning process unproblematic (Freeman, 2004). Content is perceived to contain inherent codes that are stably transmitted through the use of language and images. The transmitter and receiver of content are irrelevant due to the stability of the content itself. As a result, the assumption is made that teaching and learning are directly related - what is taught is also learned. This notion of learning was promoted in early-formed structures of education in which the complexities of the learning process were downplayed by organizing knowledge into disciplines that were parceled out into specific chunks of time and assessed based on pre-determined outcomes. The continual reinforcement of this view of learning through generations has solidified it as a folk pedagogy (Bruner, 1996) beyond conscious reproach. The result is that learning is conceptualized as product-oriented rather than process-oriented. In other words, learning involves the acquisition of something tangent rather than a process that leads to more ambiguous development.

This view of learning, or epistemological frame, is significant because it undermines the authority of task-based language teaching and acts as an impediment to its utilization. Teachers who perceive of learning in this manner will not comprehend the value of a process-oriented approach. As a result, it is unlikely that TBLT would be utilized by an individual who ascribes to this epistemology and, therefore, feels the need to cover the content from the curriculum. Several of the students in the study, most notably Brooke and Catriona, demonstrated this particular view of learning.

A fourth factor influencing student teachers' decision-making was the desire to establish their legitimacy within the profession. In order to gain acceptance within a profession, individuals must demonstrate behaviours associated with that profession. For novice teachers this manifested itself in the use of 'proven' methods. The 'proven' methods demonstrated by individuals within the field of second language teaching typically assume a form similar to the PPP sequence of instruction (Kumaravadivelu, 2006). For the student teachers in the study, strategies used by their mentor teachers constituted 'tried and true' strategies of the profession. Therefore, mimicking the mentor teacher offered a secure route to gaining acceptance as a professional.

Norms of teaching are not exclusively relayed through the examples provided by professionals. Tacit discourses of education also have a normative effect on perceptions of teaching and teachers. Drawing on the Foucauldian view of discourse, Moore (2004) defined the term as:

> The constructed parameters within which our perception(s) of the social world and our actions within it are framed – parameters essentially produced and sustained by language and 'knowledge' and (at least in the case of what I am calling 'dominant discourses') controlled and patrolled by ideologies that generally serve the interests of the already powerful at the expense of the already disempowered. (p.28)

Moore (2004) noted that the authority of discourses is based on their influence on how we perceive and experience the world. The embedded nature of discourses promotes the perception that they evolved naturally, thus placing them beyond reproach and legitimizing them at the expense of other viewpoints. Moore (2004) explained that educational discourses are based on partial truths that contribute to general understanding about the profession. However, when a particular discourse establishes dominant authority over others, it promotes an erroneous view of the profession.

Britzman (2003) identified three cultural myths based on particular discourses of education. These myths portray the teacher as an 'expert' who is in control of the learning environment. In the field of second language education these perceptions of the teacher relate to their knowledge of the content (the language) and their ability to maintain control in the classroom (classroom management). The literature on second language teaching supports this by promoting a view of good teachers as possessing near- native proficiency (Medgyes, 1999) and sophisticated knowledge about grammar (Schulz, 2001; Borg, 2005). In fact, in quoting a teacher from his study Borg (2005) wrote: "If it's something in grammar and the teacher doesn't know the answer, I think the student will automatically say 'what a horrible teacher'. I mean you're expected to know all the grammar" (p. 335). This highlights the pervasiveness of the expectation of expertise among teachers.

These cultural expectations about teaching had a normative effect on the student teachers' practices during the practicum. Utilizing techniques that required the student teachers to assume non-traditional roles presented an element of risk. If student teachers were not able to maintain the perception of expertise and control over the learning environment, they jeopardized breaking expectations about teaching and undermining their legitimacy. This caused a number of student teachers (most notably Brooke and Deidra) to quickly return to traditional practices when experimentation was perceived as unsuccessful.

Finally, lack of support constituted a major factor influencing student teachers' practices in the classroom. The experiences of the student teachers demonstrated that collaboration was not a major characteristic of the practicum. For Annika and Deidra collaboration was non-existent. These student teachers were perceived as reducing the workload of their mentors, thus freeing them up to attend to other concerns. As a result, they were largely left without guidance in the classroom. In contrast, Brooke and Catriona worked closely with their mentor teachers; however, this did not assume a collaborative form, as the voice of the student teachers was muted by the mentor teachers' demands that the students adhere to their model of teaching. The form of school culture found in each of these settings would, thus, best be categorized as individualistic.

The culture of schools was not the only mitigating factor in the support provided for student teachers. The structure of the teacher education program was also an inhibiting factor. The relationship between the university and schools would best be described as a form of critical dissonance. Relationships between curriculum instructors and the schools were based on personal initiative rather than programmatic structures. Moreover, the teacher education program promoted a dichotomous relationship between theory and practice. Student teachers enrolled in a series of courses. Once the class work had been completed and theoretical knowledge established, student teachers were then sent out to complete their practicum. Opportunities were not provided to contextualize theoretical knowledge or to provide opportunities to discuss practical issues encountered during experiences in the classroom. As a result, the individuals who helped shape students' initial professional knowledge, curriculum instructors, were absent when this knowledge was expected to be transformed in the classroom setting.

The absence of support for student teachers had an adverse influence on their professional development. First, it promoted feelings of frustration and inadequacy. Many of the student teachers encountered difficulties translating theoretical ideas into practice. Failure to meet the expectations created during coursework, thus promoted a sense of failure. Second, experimentation was limited by the absence of support.

Brooke, for example, attempted to utilize group work in her German class. The experience was not successful and Brooke had no venue to acquire support in identifying ways that improvement could have been enacted. As a result, further attempts to experiment were avoided. This had the effect of turning the practicum into a training exercise. Dewey (cited in Shulman, 1998) distinguished between two forms of practical preparation. The first he labeled the 'apprenticeship.' This approach was based on developing the practical skills needed to do a job effectively. The second approach, labeled the 'laboratory', was premised on promoting experimentation leading to a more sophisticated understanding about education. The absence of collaborative support, thus, turned the practicum into an apprenticeship in which students were trained to teach in a particular manner.

Implications

The results of this study have numerous implications for the advancement of TBLT and the development of teacher education programs. The literature on the implementation of TBLT has focused on the experiences of veteran teachers in the classroom. This literature has identified a number of factors inhibiting the use of the approach in second language classrooms including the absence of resources (Carless, 2003; Richards & Rodgers, 2001), incompatibility with testing practices (Carless, 2002; Ellis, 2003), classroom management issues (Carless, 2002, 2004), and the linguistic abilities of the learners (Carless, 2004). Teachers in these studies were introduced to the approach after it was mandated by the government. Therefore, it is highly unlikely that they would have been exposed to TBLT during their early professional preparation. This is a significant consideration in interpreting the results.

The current study contributes to the literature on the implementation of TBLT by explicating issues related to pre-service teachers' perspectives on the approach and its utilization. The results demonstrate that the apprenticeship of observation presents a significant obstacle to the adoption of TBLT. Student teachers' early experiences as language learners provide a framework through which they view second language teaching and learning and interpret alternative conceptions. As demonstrated in this study, early conceptions about second language education are largely based on teacher-centered approaches that ascribe to a product view of learning. This inhibits students' ability to comprehend the value of TBLT and to establish mental images of themselves utilizing the approach.

The results from the study also point to several issues related to the implementation of TBLT in language classrooms. As identified in the literature, the absence of resources presents a significant impediment to adopting TBLT. Student teachers were forced to either develop their own materials or avoid using the approach. The former option is quite time consuming and requires skills that Samuda (2007) pointed out are quite complex and not always adequately developed in teachers. Moreover, classroom management was perceived as a barrier to the implementation of TBLT. Classroom management was identified as a significant determiner of educational practices. Student teachers believed that maintaining control in the classrooms was an important indicator of their competence as a teacher. TBLT did not allow them to control the flow and content of the lesson, thus, it was perceived as a risky undertaking.

Finally, the study demonstrated that cultural norms of teaching act as an impediment to the implementation of TBLT. Cultural norms posit the 'good teacher' as a language expert who effectively controls learning episodes. In the context of a second language classroom expertise is often demonstrated through communicative competence and grammatical knowledge. However, task-based language teaching is a student-centered approach in which the teacher plays less of a direct role in learning activities. As a result, few opportunities are presented for the teacher to demonstrate her expertise. This is significant for novice teachers whose legitimacy as an educator is not based on experience.

In addition to identifying a number of issues with the implementation of TBLT among pre-service teachers, the study also demonstrated the potential of a constructivist-based approach in promoting an improved disposition towards the innovation. Recognizing the influence of the apprenticeship of observation, the constructivist-based approach to teacher education was designed to promote the analysis of early conceptions of second language pedagogy as the starting point in professional development. The intent was to encourage students to analyze the intuitively based, taken-for-granted notions of second language instruction that populate their existing schemata, thus opening new spaces for potential alternatives to be considered. Qualitative data and the results of the TDS demonstrated the effectiveness of the strategy in meeting this goal.

The issues identified in implementing TBLT and the benefits of the inquiry based approach to teacher education point to a critical aspect of task-based language pedagogy that has not been widely investigated - implementation. Applied linguists have conducted valuable research that has expanded our understanding of task characteristics and the influence of various variables on second language acquisition (for a summary see Skehan, 1998; Ellis, 2003). However, for this research to be truly influential and for task-based language teaching to be more than a theoretical concept, greater attention needs to be given to the development of materials and the strategies and structures used to introduce prospective teachers to the approach. Failure to do so may result in Davies' (2007) comment that TBLT is a part of the history of second language pedagogy (as opposed to the present or future) becoming prophetic.

The results of the study also have numerous implications for the development of teacher education programs. On a structural level the findings point towards the need to create a more symbiotic relationship between theory and practice. As they currently exist, teacher education programs typically separate the introduction of theory and practical experiences, with extensive coursework preceding opportunities to work in schools. Within this framework, student teachers are expected to digest copious theories and concepts and then apply them in a practical setting. However, the application of theory to a practical setting is inherently a difficult undertaking (Wilhelm, 1997) and the task becomes even more complex when the time and space associated with each element are not intertwined. For the student teachers in the study, this resulted in frustration and a reduction in the significance of the learning that took place at the university.

The divide between theory and practice could be addressed by re-structuring the schedule of teacher education programs. Rather than making coursework and field experiences mutually exclusive by ensuring that one is completed before the other begins, the two components could be integrated throughout the program. Student teachers could work through their courses with intermittent breaks to gain practical experience. This would serve to ground theory in practice and promote the value of theory in addressing practical issues.

Another important step in mitigating the theory-practice divide is to establish closer relationships between teacher educators and mentor teachers. The agenda of the curriculum course instructor and the mentor teachers in this study were diametrically opposed. While the teacher educator viewed the practicum as an opportunity for student teachers to experiment and develop their own approach to teaching, several of the mentors viewed the practicum as a training exercise by mandating the adoption of a particular approach. Other teachers demonstrated ambivalence to the influence of the practicum by adopting a passive role. This also served to undermine experimentation by reducing the support needed to negotiate risk. The result was that student teachers were given inconsistent and even contradictory messages throughout their professional preparation. Student teachers responded to these incoherent messages by catering to the authoritative voice of the moment. This led to a fractured experience and undermined the effectiveness of the program in promoting meaningful professional development.

To address this deficiency an orientation needs to be established through which the various interested parties would be engaged in dialogue about the program. A component of this process would be to explicitly introduce individuals to the objectives and structure of the teacher education program. In this way practicing teachers would clearly understand the substance of the program and their role in the process. However, teachers also need to be given a voice to express their concerns and suggestions about the form and content of the process of inducting new members into the profession. In this way mutual collaboration would contribute to developing a more coherent program.

Finally, the findings of the study offer suggestions for improving the structure of the curriculum course. The course was designed to develop principled decision-makers who would apply a particular approach based on its appropriacy to the immediate context. This meant breaking the hegemony of PPP and providing students with alternative approaches to draw from. To address the pervasiveness of PPP in the psyche of the second language teaching community, a strategy was adopted that drew on students' subjectivity as an impetus for change. The definition of subjectivity adopted by the instructor portrayed the concept in individualistic terms. As a result, the inquiry component of the class exclusively centered on individual beliefs and the establishment of a coherent personal theory of second language teaching and learning. However, when students entered into the practicum personal philosophies were largely discarded and intuition became the driving force in teaching practices. Only Annika demonstrated awareness about contextual constraints and adjusted her teaching practices accordingly; the other four student teachers intuitively adjusted their teaching to satisfy their needs in the specific context but did not demonstrate that they were cognizant about these influences.

Lack of awareness about contextual influences points to the need to refine the position of subjectivity adopted in the course. Britzman (2003) noted that subjectivity should be grounded in a multiple understanding of the concept as both individual and social. This reflects the fact that knowledge and our perceptions of the world are not established in a vacuum but rather are socially mediated. Therefore, the class should address not only students' individual perspectives but also more general discourses that provide a normative effect. This involves developing what Kincheloe (2005) labeled 'historical consciousness.' Historical consciousness relates to an understanding about historical influences on current conceptions. Kincheloe (2005) wrote: "Teachers must be able to see themselves, their profession, the schools, their society, and the world itself in a larger historical context" (p.40). This would require a form of reflexivity (Moore, 2004) to be utilized in which pre-service teachers are made aware of and analyze the social and cultural contexts in which their teaching takes place. Reflexivity would, thus, move reflection from a strictly individual domain to encompass more general, yet tacitly accepted, societal influences on the educational process. This would assist students in understanding the varied influences on their teaching practices and empower them to adopt a subject position in enacting change. Therefore, reflexivity would assist pre-service teachers in becoming principled practitioners by engaging them more completely in the decision-making process.

CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION

The literature portrays schools and teachers as conservative forces that resist change (Rudduck, 1991; Fullan, 1993, 2001). Even if this is true, the profession of teaching is a dynamic entity that is constantly evolving. Expectations about the work of teachers have gradually expanded, resulting in educators assuming roles that have traditionally been filled by other individuals. Moreover, as our understanding of teaching and learning have developed, so have our expectations about what teachers should know when entering into the classroom (Edwards, 1996). This has promoted an evolving professional landscape with one constant – change. In order to prepare prospective teachers for navigating this changing landscape, teacher education programs must not only introduce innovative approaches but also develop the capacity of teachers to deal with the pressures placed upon them to change. This means that teacher education programs must not only develop prospective teachers' professional skills and knowledge but also their ability to reflexively analyze their practices and engage in professional praxis.

In order to achieve this objective, teacher educators must also reflexively analyze the principles inherent in their practices and the structures of the program. The current study demonstrated that the structure of the curriculum course and the teacher education program adversely influenced student teachers' ability to innovate. The student teachers did not possess the reflective skills or knowledge necessary to negotiate contextual constraints. Moreover, the structure of the program promoted fragmented experiences that did not offer student teachers the support needed to experiment. This indicates a need for reform to be undertaken in teacher education. Therefore, in order to develop teachers who possess the capacity to innovate and deal with change, teacher educators must first become innovators.

REFERENCES

Adey, P. (2004). *Professional development of teachers: Practice and theory.* Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Almarza, G.G. (1996). Student foreign language teacher's knowledge growth. In D. Freeman & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp.50-78). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Anderson, J.R., Reder, L.M., & Simon, H.A. (1996). Situated learning and education. *Educational Researcher, 25*(4), 5-11.

Bailey, F. (1996). The role of collaborative dialogue in teacher education. In D. Freeman & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp.260-280). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bailey, K.M., Bergthold, B, Braunstein, B, Fleischman, N.J., Holbrook, M.P., Tuman, J., Waissbluth, X., & Zambo, L.J. (1996). The language learner's autobiography: Examining the "apprenticeship of observation." In D. Freeman & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp.260-280). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barnett, D., & Smith, D. (1992). *Preparation for classroom teaching*. Toronto: Harcourt Brace.

Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Beijaard, D., & Verloop, N. (1996). Assessing teachers' practical knowledge. *Studies in Educational Evaluation, 22*, 275-286.

Berliner, D.C. (1985). Effective classroom teaching: The necessary but not sufficient condition for developing exemplary schools. In G.R. Austin & H. Garber (Eds.), *Research on exemplary schools*(pp. 127-155). New York: Academic Press.

Bogdan, R.C., & Biklen, S.K. (2007). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods* (5th Edition). Boston: Pearson.

Bonner, M, Koch, T., & Langmeyer, D. (2004). Organizational theory applied to school reform: a critical analysis. *School Psychology International, 25*, 455 471.

Borg, S. (1998). Teachers' pedagogical systems and grammar teaching: A qualitative study. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 9-35.

Borg, S. (1999). The use of grammatical terminology in the second language classroom: A qualitative study of teachers' practices and cognitions. *Applied Linguistics, 20*(1), 95-126.

Borg, S. (2003). Teacher cognition in grammar teaching: a literature review. *Language Awareness, 12*(2), 96-108.

Borg, S. (2005). Experience, knowledge about language and classroom practice in teaching grammar. In N. Bartels (Ed.), *Applied linguistics and language teacher education* (pp. 325-340). New York: Springer.

Breen, M. (1987). Contemporary paradigms in syllabus design. *Language Teaching, 20*, 157-174.

Britzman, D. (2003). *Practice makes practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Bruner, J. (1996). *The culture of education*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Bullough, R.V. Jr. (1989). *First-year teacher: A case study*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bullough, R.V. Jr (1994). Personal history and teaching metaphors: A self-study of teaching as conversation. *Teacher Education Quarterly, 21*(1), 107-120.

Bygate, M. (1996). Effects of task repetition: appraising the developing language of learners. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 136-146). Oxford: MacMillan Heinemann.

Bygate, M. (1999). Task as the context for the framing, re-framing and un-framing of language. *System, 27*, 33-48.

Calderhead, J. (1984). *Teachers' classroom decision making*. London: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Carless, D. (2002). Implementing task-based learning with young learners. *ELT Journal, 56*, 389-396.

Carless, D. (2003). Factors in the implementation of task-based teaching in primary schools. *System, 31*, 485-500.

Carless, D. (2004). Issues in teachers' reinterpretation of a task-based innovation in primary schools. *TESOL Quarterly, 38*, 639-662.

Chaudron, C. (1985). Intake: On models and methods for discovering learners' processing of input. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 7*, 1-14).

Cheng, L. (2002). The washback effect of public examinations. In S.J. Savignon (Ed.), *Interpreting communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (pp. 91-111). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Chubbuck, S.M., Clift, R.T., Allard, J., & Quinlan, J. (2001). Playing it safe as a novice teacher. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*, 365-376.

Clandinin, D.J. (1986). *Classroom practice: Teacher images in action*. London: The Falmer Press.

Clark, C.M. (1988). Asking the right questions about teacher preparation: Contributions of research on teacher thinking. *Educational Researcher, 17*(2), 5-12.

Clark, C.M., & Peterson, P.L. (1986). Teachers' thought processes. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (pp. 255-296). New York: MacMillan.

Cochran-Smith, M. (1991). Reinventing student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42*, 104-118.

Cook, V. (2001). *Second language learning and language teaching* (3rd Edition). London: Arnold.

Creswell, J.W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Creswell, J.W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (2nd Edition). Upper Saddle River: Pearson.

Crookes, G. (2003). *A practicum in TESOL: Professional development through teaching practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Davies, P. (2007). TBL: What has task-based learning given us? *Modern English Teachers, 16*(2), 48-51.

Denzin, N. (2001). Strategies of multiple triangulation. In C.F. Conrad, J.G. Haworth, & L.R. Lattuca (Eds.), *Qualitative research in higher education: Expanding perspectives* (2nd Edition) (pp. 317-328). Boston: Pearson.

Duffy, G., & Anderson, L. (1986). Teachers' theoretical orientations and the real classroom. *Reading Psychology, 5*, 97-104.

Dunkin, M., & Biddle, B. (1974). *The study of teaching*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Edelsky, C. (1996). *With literacy and justice for all: Rethinking the social in language and education* (2nd Edition). London: Taylor & Francis.

Edwards, C. (1996). Learning to learn how to teach: Developing expertise through experience. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 99-107). Oxford: MacMillan Heinemann.

Ellis, R. (1997). *SLA research and language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ellis, R., Tanaka, Y., & Yamazaki, A. (1994). Classroom interaction, comprehension, and the acquisition of L2 word meanings. *Language Learning, 44*, 449-491.

Eykin, L.B. (1987). Confessions of a high school language teacher, or "Why I never (used to) read *Foreign Language Annals*." *Foreign Language Annals, 20*, 265-266.

Fosnot, C.T. (2005a). Teachers construct constructivism: The center for constructivist teaching/teacher preparation project. In C.T.Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism:*

Theory, perspectives, and practice (pp. 263-275). New York: Teachers College Press.

Fosnot, C.T. (2005b). Constructivism revisited: Implications and reflections. In C.T. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (pp. 276-291). New York: Teachers College Press.

Foster, P. (1996). Doing the task better: How planning time influences students' performance. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 126-135). Oxford: MacMillan Heinemann.

Foster, P., & Skehan, P. (1996). The influence of planning on performance in task based learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 18*, 299-324.

Freeman, D. (1996). The "unstudied problem": Research on teacher learning in language teaching. In D. Freeman, & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp. 351-378). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freeman, D. (2004). Language, sociocultural theory, and L2 teacher education: Examining the technology of subject matter and the architecture of instruction. In M.R. Hawkins (Ed.), *Language learning and teacher education: A sociocultural perspective* (pp. 169-197). Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Freeman, D., & Johnson, K.E. (1998). Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 397-417.

Freeman, D., & Richards, J.C. (1993). Conceptions of teaching and the education of language teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 27*, 193-216.

Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1993). *Change forces*. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M. (2001). *Leading in a culture of change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gallego, M.A. (2001). Is experience the best teacher? The potential of coupling classroom and community-based field experiences. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*, 312-325.

Gass, S.M. (1988). Integrating research areas: A framework for second language studies. *Applied Linguistics, 9*, 198-217.

Gass, S.M. (1995). Learning and teaching: The necessary intersection. In F.R. Eckman, D. Highland, P.W. Lee, J. Mileham, & R.R Weber (Eds.), *Second language acquisition theory and pedagogy* (pp. 3-20). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Goddard, R.D. (2003). The impact of schools on teacher beliefs, influence, and student achievement. In J. Raths, & A.C. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education* (pp. 183-202). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Golombek, P.R. (1998). A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge. *TESOL Quarterly, 32*, 447-464.

Grittner, F. M. (1990). Bandwagons revisited: a perspective on movements in foreign language education. In D.W. Birckbichler (Ed.), *New perspectives and new directions in foreign language education* (pp.9-43). Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.

Harmer, J. (1998). *How to teach english*. Essex: Longman.

Hargreaves, A. (1992). Cultures of teaching: A focus for change. In A. Hargreaves, & M. Fullan (Eds.), *Understanding teacher development* (pp. 216-240). New York: Teachers College Press.

Hashweh, M.Z. (2003). Teacher accommodative change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 19*, 421-434.

Hawkey, K. (1996). Image and the pressure to conform in learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*, 99-108.

Hawkins, M.R. (Ed.). (2004). *Language learning and teacher education: A sociocultural approach*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Hayes, D. (1995). In-service teacher development: Some basic principles. *ELT Journal,49*, 252-261.

Hewson, P., & Hewson, M. (1989). Analysis and use of a task for identifying conceptions of teaching science. *Journal of Education for Teaching, 15*, 191 209.

Hoffman-Kipp, P., & Olsen, B. (2007). Accessing praxis: Practicing theory, theorizing practice in social justice teachers' first year of teaching. In P.J. Finn & M.E. Finn (Eds.), *Teacher education with an attitude: Preparing teachers to educate working-class students in their collective self-interest* (pp. 141-155). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Hudelson, S., & Faltis, C. (1993). Redefining basic teacher education: Preparing teachers to transform teaching. In G. Guntermann (Ed.), *Developing language teachers for a changing world* (pp. 23-42). Lincolnwood: National Textbook Company.

Jackson, P.W. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2000). *Educational research: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Johnson, K.E. (1992a). Learning to teach: Instructional actions and decisions of preservice ESL teachers. *TESOL Quarterly, 26*, 507-533.

Johnson, K.E. (1992b). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices during literacy instruction for non-native speakers of English. *Journal of Reading Behavior, 24*, 83-108.

Johnson, K.E. (1994). The emerging beliefs and instructional practices of preservice English as a second language teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 10*, 439-452.

Johnson, K.E. (1996). The vision versus the reality: The tensions of the TESOL practicum. In D. Freeman & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp.30-49). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Johnson, K.E. (1999). *Understanding language teaching*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Johnson, K.E. (2006). The sociocultural turn and its challenges for second language teacher education. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 235-257.

Kagan, D. (1992a). Implications of research on teacher belief. *Educational Psychologist, 27*, 65-90.

Kagan, D. (1992b). Professional growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 129-169.

Karavas-Doukas, E. (1996). Using attitude scales to investigate teachers' attitudes to the communicative approach. *ELT Journal, 50*, 187-198.

Karavas-Doukas, K. (1998). Evaluating the implementation of educational innovations: Lessons from the past. In P. Rea-Dickins, & K.P. Germaine (Eds.), *Managing evaluation and innovation in language teaching* (pp.25-50). London: Longman.

Keck, C.M., Iberri-Shea, G., Tracy-Ventura, N., & Wa-Mbaleka, S. (2006). Investigating the empirical link between task-based interaction and acquisition: A meta-analysis. In J.M. Norris & L. Ortega (Eds.), *Synthesizing research on language learning and teaching* (pp. 91-132). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Kennedy, C. (1987). Innovating for a change: Teacher development and innovation. *ELT Journal, 41*, 163-170.

Kennedy, M.M. (1997). The connection between research and practice. *Educational Researcher, 26*(7), 4-12.

Kessels, J.P.A.M., & Korthagen, F.A.J. (1996). The relationship between theory and practice: Back to the classics. *Educational Researcher, 25*(3), 17-22.

Kincheloe, J.L. (2005). *Classroom teaching: An introduction.* New York: Peter Lang.

Kirk, D., & MacDonald, D. (2001). Teacher voice and ownership of curriculum change. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 33*, 551-567.

Korthagen, F.A.J., & Kessels, J.P.A.M. (1999). Linking theory and practice: Changing the pedagogy of teacher education. *Educational Researcher, 28*(4), 4-17.

Krashen, S. D. (1982). *Principles and practice in second language acquisition.* Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Kumaravadivelu, B. (2006). TESOL methods: Changing tracks, challenging trends. *TESOL Quarterly, 40*, 59-82.

Kwo, O. (1994). Learning to teach: Some theoretical propositions. In I. Carlgren, G. Handal, & S. Vaage (Eds.), *Teachers' minds and actions: Research on teachers' thinking and practice* (pp. 215-231). London: Falmer.

Lamie, J.M. (2005). *Evaluating change in English language teaching*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan

Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lightbown, P. (1985). Great expectations: second language acquisition research and classroom teaching. Applied Linguistics, 6, 173-189.

Lightbown, P. (2000). Classroom SLA research and second language teaching. Applied Linguistics, 21, 431-462.

Lightbown, P., & Spada, N. (1999). How languages are learned. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Livingston, C., & Borko, H. (1989). Expert-novice differences in teaching: A cognitive analysis and implications. *Journal of Teacher Education, 40*(4), 36-42.

Long, M.H. (1983). Native speaker/ non-native speaker conversation and the negotiation of comprehensible input. *Applied Linguistics, 4*, 126-141.

Long, M.H. (1985). Input and second language acquisition theory. In S. Gass, & C. Madden (Eds.), *Input and second language acquisition*. Rowley: Newbury House.

Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher: a sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Loughran, J. (2006). *Developing a pedagogy of teacher education: Understanding teaching and learning about teaching*. London: Routledge.

Mackenzie, A.S. (2007). Commentary on part three: Teachers, transitions and time: Learning for educational change. In A. Barfield, & S.H. Brown (Eds.), *Reconstructing autonomy in language education* (pp. 222-230). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Mackey, A. (1999). Input, interaction, and second language development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21*, 557-587.

Macrory, G. (2000). Learning to teach grammar in the modern foreign languages classroom: Some implications for initial teacher education. *Research in Education, 64*, 1-11.

Malderez, A., & Bodoczky, C. (1999). *Mentor courses: A resource book for teacher trainers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Markee, N. (1997a). *Managing curricular innovation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Markee, N. (1997b). Second language acquisition research: A resource for changing teachers' professional cultures? *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 80-93.

Markee, N. (2000). The diffusion of innovation in language teaching. In D.R. Hall, & A. Hewings (Eds.), *Innovation in English language teaching: A reader* (pp.118 126). London: Routledge.

Marland, P.W. (1995). Implicit theories of teaching. In L.W. Anderson (Ed.), *International encyclopedia of teaching and teacher education* (2nd Edition) (pp. 131-136). New York: Pergamon.

Mayer-Smith, J.A., & Mitchell, I.J. (1997). Teaching about constructivism: Using approaches informed by constructivism. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education* (pp. 129-153). London: Falmer.

McDiarmid, G.W. (1990). Challenging prospective teachers' beliefs during early field experience: A quixotic undertaking? *Journal of Teacher Education, 41*(3), 12 20.

McDonough, K., & Chaikitmongkol, W. (2007). Teachers' and learners' reactions to a task-based EFL course in Thailand. *TESOL Quarterly, 41*, 107-132.

McNeil, L.M. (1988). *Contradictions of control: School structure and school knowledge*. New York: Routledge.

Medgyes, P. (1999). *The non-native teacher*. Germany: Hueber.

Mehnert, U. (1998). The effects of different lengths of time for planning on second language performance. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 20*, 83-108.

Merriam, S.B. (2001). Case studies as qualitative research. In C.F. Conrad, J.G. Haworth, & L.R. Lattuca (Eds.), *Qualitative research in higher education: Expanding perspectives* (2nd Edition) (pp. 191-202). Boston: Pearson.

Mitchell, R., & Myles, F. (2004). *Second language learning theories* (2nd Edition). London: Arnold.

Moore, A. (2004). *The good teacher: Dominant discourses in teaching and teacher education*. London: Routledge Falmer.

Moser, J. (2005). Using language-focused learning journals on a task-based course. In C. Edwards & J. Willis (Eds.), *Teachers exploring tasks in English language teaching* (pp. 78-87). Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan.

Moser, J. (2007, September). Taking program innovation to task: A descriptive account of how a task-based language program was introduced into a Japanese university. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Task Based Language Teaching, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Murrell Jr., P.C., & Foster, M. (2003). Teacher beliefs, performance, and proficiency in diversity-oriented teacher preparation. In J. Raths, & A.C. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education*. Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Myers, C.B. (2002). Can self-study challenge the belief that telling, showing, and guided practice constitute adequate teacher education? In J. Loughran, & T. Russell(Eds.), *Improving teacher education practices through self-study* (pp. 130-142). London: Routledge Falmer.

Nespor, J. (1987). The role of beliefs in the practice of teaching. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 19*, 317-328.

Nias, J., Southworth, G., & Campbell, P. (1992). *Whole school curriculum development in the primary school*. London: Falmer.

Novak, J.D., & Gowan, D.B. (1984). *Learning how to learn*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Oppenheim, A.N. (1992). *Questionnaire design, interviewing and attitude measurement*. London: Pinter.

Pajares, M. F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: cleaning up a messy construct. *Review of Educational Research, 62*, 307-332.

Patterson, J.A. (2002). Exploring reform as symbolism and expression of belief. *Educational Foundations, 16*(2), 55-75.

Peacock, M. (2001). Pre-service ESL teachers' beliefs about language learning: A longitudinal study. *System, 29*, 177-195.

Prabhu, N.S. (1987). *Second language pedagogy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Prabhu, N.S. (1990). There is no best method – why? *TESOL Quarterly, 24*, 161-176.

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1999). *Understanding learning and teaching: The experience in higher education*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Richards, J.C. (1987). The dilemma of teacher preparation in TESOL. *TESOL Quarterly, 22*, 9-27.

Richards, J.C. (1991). Reflective teaching in TESOL teacher education. In E. Sadtono (Ed.), *Issues in language teacher education* (pp. 1-19). Singapore: SEAMEO Regional Language Centre.

Richards, J.C. (1998). *Beyond training*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C. (2005). Second thoughts on teaching listening. *Regional Language Centre Journal, 36*, 85-92.

Richards, J.C., & Farrell, T.S.C. (2005). *Professional development for language teachers: Strategies for teacher learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Ho, B. (1998). Reflective thinking through journal writing. In J.C. Richards (Ed.), *Beyond Training* (pp. 153-170). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Pennington, M. (1998). The first year of teaching. In J.C. Richards (Ed.), *Beyond Training* (pp. 173-200). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Rodgers, T.S. (2001). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (2nd Edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Richards, J.C., & Schmidt, R.W. (2002). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (3rd Edition). London: Longman.

Richardson, V. (1990). Significant and worthwhile change in teaching practice. *Educational Researcher, 19*, 10-18.

Richardson, V. (1994). Conducting research on practice. *Educational Researcher, 23*(5), 5-10.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach. In: J.Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*. (p. 102 – 119) New York: Macmillan.

Richardson, V. (1997). Constructivist teaching and teacher education: Theory and practice. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist teacher education* (pp. 3-14). London: Falmer.

Richardson, V. (2003). Preservice teachers' beliefs. In J. Raths, & A.C. McAninch (Eds.), *Teacher beliefs and classroom performance: The impact of teacher education* (pp. 1-22). Greenwich: Information Age Publishing.

Rogers, E.M. (1995). *Diffusion of innovations* (4th Edition). New York: The Free Press.

Rowe, M.B. (1974). Wait time and rewards s instructional variable: Their influence on language, logic and fate control. Part 1: Fate control. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 11*, 81-94.

Rudduck, J. (1991). *Innovation and change*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.

Samuda, V. (2005). Expertise in pedagogic task design. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching* (pp.230-254). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Samuda, V. (2007, September). Tasks, design, and the architecture of pedagogic spaces. Paper presented at the Second International Conference on Task-Based Language Teaching, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Saville-Troike, M. (2006). *Introducing Second Language Acquisition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schmidt, R.W. (1990). The role of consciousness-raising in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 11*, 129-159.

Schmidt, R.W., & Frota, S. (1986). Developing basic conversational ability in a second language: A case study of an adult learner of Portuguese. In R. Day (Ed.), *Talking to learn: Conversation in second language acquisition* (pp. 237-326). Rowley: Newbury House Publishers.

Schulz, R. (2001). Cultural differences in student and teacher perceptions concerning the role of grammar instruction and corrective feedback: USA-Colombia. *The Modern Language Journal, 85*, 243-258.

Schwartz, A. (2002). National standards and the diffusion of innovation: Language teaching in the United States. In S.J. Savignon (Ed.), *Interpreting* *communicative language teaching: Contexts and concerns in teacher education* (pp. 112-130). New Haven: Yale University Press.

Sercu, L., & St. John, O. (2007). Teacher beliefs and their impact on teaching practice: A literature review. In M.J. Raya & L. Sercu (Eds.), *Challenges in teacher development: Learner autonomy and intercultural competence* (pp. 41-64). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Shulman, L.S. (1998). Theory, practice, and the education of professionals. *The Elementary School Journal, 98*, 511-526.

Skehan, P. (1996). Second language acquisition research and task-based instruction. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 17-30). Oxford: MacMillan Heinemann.

Skehan, P. (1998). *A cognitive approach to language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Smith, D.B. (1996). Teacher decision making in the adult ESL classroom. In D. Freeman & J.C. Richards (Eds.), *Teacher learning in language teaching* (pp.197 216). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Spillane, J.P. (1999). External reform initiatives and teachers' efforts to reconstruct their practice: the mediating role of teachers' zones of enactment. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 31*, 143-175.

Sprinthall, N.A., Reiman, A.J., & Thies-Sprinthall, L. (1996). Teacher professional development. In: J.Sikula (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education.* (pp. 666 – 703) New York: Macmillan.

Stake, R.E. (2000). Case studies. In N.K. Denzin, & Y.S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook on qualitative research* (2nd Edition) (pp. 435-448). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Swain, M. (2000). The output hypothesis and beyond: Mediating acquisition through collaborative dialogue. In J. Lantolf (Ed.), *Sociocultural theory and second language learning* (pp. 97-114). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swain, M., & Lapkin, S. (1995). Problems in output and the cognitive processes they generate: A step towards second language learning. *Applied Linguistics, 16*, 371 391).

Tabachnick, B.R., & Zeichner, K.M. (1986). Teacher beliefs and classroom behaviors: Some teacher responses to inconsistency. In M. Ben-Peretz, R. Bromme, & R. Halkes (Eds.), *Advances of research on teacher thinking* (pp. 84-96). Berwyn: Swets.

Thornbury, S. (1999). *How to teach grammar*. Essex: Longman.

Tillema, H.H. (2004). Embedding and immersion as key strategies in learning to teach. In H.P.A. Boshuizen, R. Bromme, & H. Gruber (Eds.), *Professional learning: Gaps and transitions on the way from novice to expert* (pp. 141-156). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Tochon, F.V., & Gwyn-Paquette, C. (2003). Preservice teachers reflections on risk taking: The dynamics of practice and experience while experimenting with innovation during student teaching. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 49*, 163-180.

Tsang, W.K. (2004). Teachers' personal practical knowledge and interactive decisions. *Language Teaching Research, 8*(2), 163-198.

Ur, P. (1988). *Grammar practice activities: A practical guide for teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Van Eekelen, I.M., Vermunt, J.D., & Boshuizen, H.P.A. (2006). Exploring teachers' will to learn. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 22*, 408-423.

von Glasersfeld, E. (2005). Introduction: Aspects of constructivism. In C.T. Fosnot (Ed.), *Constructivism: Theory, perspectives, and practice* (pp. 3-7). New York: Teachers College Press.

Wallace, M.J. (1991). *Training foreign language teachers: A reflective approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waters, A. (2005). Expertise in teacher education: Helping teachers to learn. In K. Johnson (Ed.), *Expertise in second language learning and teaching* (pp.210 229). New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (1996). Drawing ourselves into teaching: Studying the images that shape and distort teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12*, 303-313.

Wilhelm, K.H. (1997). Sometimes kicking and screaming: Language teachers-in training react to a collaborative learning model. *Modern Language Journal, 81*, 527-543.

Wilkerson, J.R., & Lang, W.S. (2007). *Assessing teacher dispositions: Five standards based steps to valid measurement using the DAATS model*. Thousand Oaks: Corwin.

Wilkins, D.A. (1976). *Notional syllabuses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Williams, M, & Burden, R.L. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers: A social constructivist approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Harlow, UK: Addison Wesley Longman.

Wilson, S.M., & Berne, J. (1999). Teacher learning and the acquisition of professional knowledge: An examination of research on contemporary professional development. *Review of Research in Education, 24*, 173-209.

Winitzky, N., & Kauchuk, D. (1997). Constructivism in teacher education: Applying cognitive theory to teacher learning. In V. Richardson (Ed.), *Constructivist Teacher Education* (pp. 59-83). London: Falmer.

Woods, D. (1991). Teachers' interpretations of second language teaching curricula. *RELC Journal, 22*(2), 1-18.

Woodward, T. (1996). Paradigm shift and the language teaching profession. In J. Willis & D. Willis (Eds.), *Challenge and change in language teaching* (pp. 4-9). Oxford: MacMillan Heinemann.

Appendix A: Pedagogical Beliefs Scale

Language Pedagogy Beliefs Scale

Read each of the following statements carefully and place a √ in the box that best describes your perspective on the statement

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.					
2) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).					
3) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.					
4) Learners bring a wealth of knowledge and experience about language learning to the classroom. Teachers simply facilitate skill development by creating an environment conducive to learning.					
5) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.					
6) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.					
7) Cultural knowledge is essential in promoting effective communication. As a result, language teachers must incorporate activities to promote intercultural competence in their classrooms.					
8) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.					
9) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.					
10) Teachers do not need to plan all activities in a lesson but must be flexible and able to adapt instruction based on students' performance in class.					
11) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.					
12) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.					

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
13) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.					
14) Culture is taught in social studies and learned when an individual travels to various countries. Therefore, time in a second language classroom should be spent learning the target language rather than culture.					
15) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.					
16) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.					
17) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.					
18) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.					
19) As the expert, the role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge to students through explanations, notes, activities, etc.					
20) To facilitate effective learning, a brief presentation must set the direction for the lesson.					
21) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.					
22) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.					
23) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.					
24) Exercises/drills are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.					
25) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.					
26) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.					

Topics Addressed in Pedagogical Beliefs Scale (PBS)

Topic	PBS Statements
1) Error Correction	#1 and #9
2) Role of the Teacher	#19 and #4
3) Focus on Process vs. Product	#22 and #18
4) Role of Culture	#7 and #14
5) Student vs. Teacher-Directed Instruction	#20 and #10
6) Explicit Grammar Instruction	#21 and #23
7) Group Work	#6 and #15
8) Use of Exercises/Drills	#11 and #24
9) Syllabus Design	#2 and #17
10) Learner Input	#12 and #26
11) Promoting Autonomy	#3 and #13
12) Fluency vs. Accuracy	#5 and #8
13) Language Use vs. Language Study	#16 and #25

**** Note: The first statement listed is the negative statement regarding the topic and the second statement is the positive statement.**

Appendix B: Reliability Score for Pedagogical Beliefs Scale Statements

Language Pedagogy Beliefs Scale

Read each of the following statements carefully and place a √ in the box that best describes your perspective on the statement

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree	Pt. Total
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.		14	10	21	7	177 (135)
2) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.	2	20	11	16	3	154 (158)
3) As the expert, the role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge to students through explanations, notes, activities, etc.	1	2	7	32	10	204 (108)
4) Learners bring a wealth of knowledge and experience about language learning to the classroom. Teachers simply facilitate skill development by creating an environment conducive to learning.		5	13	27	7	192 (120)
5) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.	1	9	15	20	7	179 (133)
6) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.	1	8	10	27	6	185 (127)
7) Cultural knowledge is essential in promoting effective communication. As a result, language teachers must incorporate activities to promote intercultural competence in their classrooms.			2	24	26	232 (80)
8) Culture is taught in social studies and learned when an individual travels to various countries. Therefore, time in a second language classroom should be spent learning the target language rather than culture.	24	25	2	1		84 (228)
9) To facilitate effective learning, a brief presentation must set the direction for the lesson.		3	15	27	7	194 (118)
10) Teachers do not need to plan all activities in a lesson but must be flexible and able to adapt instruction based on students' performance in class.	1	5	4	24	18	209 (103)

11) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.	3	7	13	27	2	174 (138)
12) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.		16	19	16	1	158 (154)
13) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.			2	28	22	228 (84)
14) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.	15	26	10	1		101 (211)
15) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.		4	14	34		186 (126)
16) Exercises are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.	3	34	9	6		122 (190)
17) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.		3	35	14		167 (145)
18) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).		5	11	27	9	196 (116)
19) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.	15	26	7	3	1	105 (207)
20) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.		1	5	24	22	223 (89)
21) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.	16	25	5	6		105 (207)

22) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.			5	36	11	214 (98)
23) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.	11	33	7	1		102 (210)
24) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.	2	8	15	22	5	176 (136)
25) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.		1	13	29	9	202 (110)
26) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.	1	10	23	16	2	164 (148)

*The number in brackets represents the result if the reverse scale were used. This number is used to compare the accuracy of responses to the paired statements.

Maximum Points = 260
Minimum Points = 52

**** The larger the number the more students agree with the statement. Conversely the lower the number the more students disagree with the statement as a whole.**

Question Clusters:

Pair #1 (Questions #1/#2) = .89

Pair #2 (Questions #3/#4) = .59

Pair #3 (Questions #5/#6) = .72

Pair #4 (Questions #7/#8) = .98

Pair #5 (Questions #9/#10) = .56

Pair #6 (Questions #11/#12) = .89

Pair #7 (Questions #13/#14) = .93

Pair #8 (Questions #15/#16) = .98

Pair #9 (Questions #17/#18) = .74

Pair #10 (Questions #19/#20) = .93

Pair #11 (Questions #21/#22) = .97

Pair #12 (Questions #23/#24) = .84

Pair #13 (Questions #25/#26) = .73

According to Oppenheim (1992) most Likert scales achieve a reliability of .85. Pairs #2, 3, 5, 9, and 13 do not meet this standard; however, only pairs #2 (the role of the teacher) and #5 (teacher-directed vs. student-directed lessons) are significantly below this standard. The overall reliability of the test is .83, which is just slightly below Oppenheim's standard of reliability but still reasonable. When the two lowest pairs are eliminated, the overall standard of reliability for the instrument is .87.

Appendix C: Lesson Analyses

Lesson Analysis

Three lesson descriptions using different instructional models are provided below. Read through the lessons carefully and analyze each lesson according to your beliefs about foreign language pedagogy. Your analysis of the lessons should include information about the following areas: 1) The effectiveness of the lesson in promoting second language learning; 2) The appeal of the lesson for high school students; 3) The ease of the lesson for teachers to deliver; 4) The aspects of the lesson that you find appealing and the rationale behind the appeal; 5) The aspects of the lesson you dislike and why. At the conclusion of the analysis identify the lesson that you would most likely use in your classroom and explain the reasons for your decision.

Lesson #1

Stage One – The teacher explains to students that they are going to learn about the conditional construct in today's class. The teacher divides the blackboard into three columns and labels the columns type one, type two and type three. The teacher then writes several examples of sentences in each column and asks students to identify how they are different. After discussing the differences the teacher writes notes explaining how the constructs are formed and when they are used. In the meantime, students copy the notes. The teacher asks questions to gauge students' comprehension of the constructs.

Stage Two – The teacher writes a series of clause pairs on the blackboard (i.e. go to school/ be very smart) and asks students to create sentences using the various conditional types by joining the clauses together (i.e. If I had gone to school, I would have been very smart. If I go to school, I will be very smart. If I went to school, I would be very smart.). After students complete the exercise individually, the teacher elicits the correct answer from students. Errors are corrected by asking students to refer back to their notes to make sure they were using the correct form.

Stage Three – Students are given a worksheet including a number of exercises – joining clauses to create a conditional sentence, changing sentences to fit into the different types of conditionals (i.e. 'If I had a million dollars, I would buy a car' changed to 'If I had had a million dollars, I would have bought a car'). , and fill-in-the-blank exercises in which students must use the correct form of the verb to complete the conditional sentences. While students complete the drills individually the teacher moves around the class and monitors students' progress. Assistance is provided when errors are detected.

Stage Four – Using a random pattern of calling on students, the teacher has students provide the answer to each question while the other students correct any mistakes they might have made. The teacher provides an explanation and additional examples when students demonstrate difficulty understanding concepts.

Stage Five – The teacher asks students to write three sentences using each of the conditional types. After completing the sentences, students share their sentences with a partner.

Lesson #1 Analysis

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

Lesson #2

Stage One – The teacher writes "If I had a million dollars" on the blackboard and explains to students that they are going to listen to a song performed by a famous Canadian band, the Barenaked Ladies. The teacher explains that students should listen carefully to the song and write down what the band states they would buy if they had a million dollars.

Stage Two – The teacher plays the song two to three times and asks volunteers to share what they heard from the song. As students provide items from their lists, the teacher jots them down on the blackboard at the end of the sentence "If they had a million dollars, they would buy . . ." The teacher discusses the meaning of the words from the song and explains the cultural significance of some of the items.

Stage Three – The teacher writes a series of other type two conditional sentences on the board. In small groups, students are asked to discuss the examples and establish rules to explain how the type two conditional is formed and when it is used. After working in small groups, students share their ideas with the whole class and a common rule is written on the blackboard by the teacher.

Stage Four – The teacher writes a series of type one conditional sentences beside the other list and asks students in their groups to differentiate between the two groups and explain how and when the type one conditional is used. A whole class discussion follows and a common rule is written on the board.

Stage Five – The teacher explains that type one conditionals are used for superstitions. Several Canadian superstitions are provided and explained. Students are asked to write a number of superstitions from their own culture and then are encouraged to share them with peers in small groups.

Stage Six – For homework students are asked to write type two conditional sentences explaining what they would do . . . a) if they were in their home country? b) if they won the lottery? c) if they found a genie in a bottle? d) if they found ten dollars on the street? e) if they saw a ghost?

Lesson #2 Analysis

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

Lesson #3

Stage One – The teacher tells an anecdote about how decisions made by politicians can have a major impact on people's lives (for example, President George Bush's decision to invade Iraq without conclusive evidence to back up his claims about the production of weapons of mass – destruction). Students are encouraged to share similar stories from their experiences or to comment on the Bush example.

Stage Two – The teacher shows the students some newspaper headlines referring to the surplus that Alberta enjoys as a result of the rising oil prices and states that Alberta politicians are now faced with the difficult decision about how to spend the surplus. Students are split into small groups and asked to discuss how they think the money should be spent. After a short discussion, the teacher again regains students' attention and asks them to listen to a tape recording of three people talking about the federal budget and how they think it should be distributed. After listening to the recording once, students are given a transcript of the recording and are asked to read the transcript while listening to the tape. The teacher asks students to jot down any constructs that may be useful in their discussion about Alberta's surplus.

Stage Three – Students return to their small groups and are asked to debate how the money should be spent and to come to a consensus. Students are informed that at the end of the group task they will be asked to present a short report to the group explaining how they would spend the money and the reasons behind their decision.

Stage Four – As students discuss the topic and prepare the presentation, the teacher rotates around the room and provides assistance. When necessary the teacher explains how conditional clauses and the should/ ought to construct may be used in formulating the argument.

Stage Five – Each of the groups presents their findings to the class. After all presentations have been made, the class engages in a general discussion about the topic.

Stage Six – Led by the teacher, students are encouraged to reflect upon the activity. In particular they are encouraged to reflect upon how well they worked as a group and how they utilized the language at their disposal. If students still experience difficulties with some of the linguistic concepts, the teacher provides further instruction.

Lesson #3 Analysis

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

Which lesson would you prefer to teach? Explain the reasons for your decision.

Appendix D: Analysis of Experiences as a Language Learner

Experiences as a Language Learner

In the following sections you will be asked to think back to your experiences as a language learner and reflect on the language learning process. Please try to provide as much detail as possible as this information will be used to complete later assignments. When considering your experiences as a learner, think carefully about the following questions: 1) how was new information presented?; 2) how was the sequence of the course structured?; 3) how much time was spent communicating in the target language?; 4) how were you assessed in the course?; 5)which skill or skills were emphasized the most in the class?; 6) how did the teacher correct students' errors?; 7) how frequently were errors corrected?; 8) what types of activities did you do during the class?

Typical Course

Using the questions provided above as a guide, describe a typical second language class that you attended as a learner. You most likely will have attended classes structured in a variety of manners; however, describe the class that best typifies your language learning experiences overall. Specific examples about activities are not as important as general information about how the class was structured.

1)

2)

3)

4)

5)

6)

7)

8)

Additional Details:

Explain what aspects of the course you believe were effective and what aspects could have been improved. Make sure you explain the rationale behind your assessment.	
Effective Aspects	Areas for Improvement

Ideal Lesson

Describe how you believe a second language classroom should be organized. Explain what content would be introduced and how the class would be structured to promote language acquisition.

Appendix E: Sample of Interview Questions

Post-Practicum Interview Questions

Questions:

1) How did the EDSE 368 class affect your perspective on teaching a foreign language? How did your beliefs change from the beginning of the class to the end?
2) Describe the setting where you did your IPT. Explain the size of the school, the make-up of the student population, your teaching assignment, etc.
3) Describe your general feelings about the practicum.
4) How did your MT teach the class?
5) Did you follow your MT's style of teaching? Why?
6) What did you like/dislike about your MT's style of teaching?
7) What forms of evaluation were used in the class? How did this affect your teaching?
8) What materials were available for use in the class? What influence did this have on your instructional practices?
9) Was classroom management a significant issue in the school? How did it affect your instructional practices?
10) How cognizant were you of the fact that you were being evaluated during the practicum?
11) What instructional model did you use most during the IPT? Why? After being exposed to teaching in an actual classroom, what instructional model(s) will you use most in your classroom as a beginning teacher? Why? Do you think that the instructional model used will change over time? What are some of the constraints to using each of the models?
12) Did you try any teaching techniques that were obviously new for students? How did they respond? Will you utilize this technique again in the future? Why? What factors will influence when you use the technique?
13) What constraints or factors affected how you carried out instruction during the IPT (i.e. textbooks, the MT, etc.)?
14) What did you find to be most beneficial about your IPT experience? What did you learn about the teaching profession through your experiences as a student-teacher?
15) How much culture did you include in your instruction? Provide examples.
16) How often did you utilize group work?
17) How did you determine what and how you were going to teach each class?
18) How did you correct students' errors?
19) What did you find to be most unexpected about teaching in a foreign language classroom? How did this affect your teaching?
20) Did you feel pressure from other teachers, administration, parents, students, the curriculum, tests, etc. to teach a particular way? Explain.
21) Teaching is a very emotional activity. Did you find that you became emotionally invested in your students and teaching in general? How did you deal with the emotional aspect of teaching?

22) Were there any times during your IPT when you felt anxious, tense or uncomfortable? What caused these feelings to occur?
23) Lasky wrote that teachers experience a sense of vulnerability when they do not feel as though they have direct control over a situation. Did you ever feel vulnerable during the practicum?
24) Did you ever perceive the IPT as being a "gate keeping" exercise?
25) What do you think were your greatest successes/challenges during the IPT?
26) What lessons did you take from your IPT experience?
27) When you have your own class, do you intend to continue to teach a foreign language just as you did during the IPT? Explain.
28) How did the IPT affect your beliefs about second language pedagogy?
29) What made you choose foreign language teaching as a profession? Has it met your expectations so far?
30) What aspects of teaching do you find most rewarding?
31) What aspects of teaching do you find frustrating?
32) Do you perceive yourself to be a "good teacher"?
33) What characteristics make you a "good teacher"? How would you describe yourself as a teacher?
34) Think back to some of the best teachers that you had. What made them so good? What other qualities do you think are important in a teacher?
35) What do you think about each of the instructional models introduced in class?
36) What role does culture play in the language classroom? How did culture influence your instructional decisions?
37) How and when would you correct students' errors?
38) What is the role of grammar in the ESL classroom?
39) What is the role of the teacher in the ESL classroom? The learner?
40) Briefly describe how you believe a classroom should be organized to promote effective learning.

41) Several dichotomies are presented below that play a role in the formation of our identity. Do you feel as though any of these identity categories are relevant for you as a teacher? Do any of these categories affect how you undertake the task of teaching? How does the fact that you are a NNS affect your teaching approach?

Native Speaker/ Non-Native Speaker
Male/ Female

Student-Teacher/ Certified Teacher
Old/ Young

Caucasian/ Non-Caucasian
Canadian/ Foreigner

42) What is your perception about the following statements about teaching?

1) Teachers are self-made
2) The teacher is an expert
3) Everything depends on the teacher

43) Look through the five lesson plans.
   1) Briefly describe the activities in the lesson. What was your rationale for using each of the activities/structuring the lesson in this way? Is this a lesson that you would use in the future? Why?
   2) Can you identify any practices that you undertook that contradicted your views about language learning? What made you do them?

Appendix F: Annika's Results from Pedagogical Beliefs Scale

Language Pedagogy Beliefs Scale

Response provided at beginning of class = x; at end of class = y; at conclusion of practicum = n.

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.	n	y			x
2) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).		yn	x		
3) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.	yn	x			
4) Learners bring a wealth of knowledge and experience about language learning to the classroom. Teachers simply facilitate skill development by creating an environment conducive to learning.		x		yn	
5) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.	xyn				
6) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.	yn	x			
7) Cultural knowledge is essential in promoting effective communication. As a result, language teachers must incorporate activities to promote intercultural competence in their classrooms.					xyn
8) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.	x			y	n
9) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.		x		yn	
10) Teachers do not need to plan all activities in a lesson but must be flexible and able to adapt instruction based on students' performance in class.					xyn
11) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.		y	n	x	
12) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.	yn			x	

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
13) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.			x	y	n
14) Culture is taught in social studies and learned when an individual travels to various countries. Therefore, time in a second language classroom should be spent learning the target language rather than culture.	xyn				
15) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.				x	yn
16) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.			yn	x	
17) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.			x	yn	
18) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.				y	xn
19) As the expert, the role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge to students through explanations, notes, activities, etc.	x	yn			
20) To facilitate effective learning, a brief presentation must set the direction for the lesson.		yn			x
21) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.		y	n	x	
22) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.		y	n		x
23) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.		x		yn	
24) Exercises/drills are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.		x	n	y	
25) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.		x		n	y
26) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.					xyn

Appendix G: Brooke's Results from Pedagogical Beliefs Scale

Language Pedagogy Beliefs Scale

Response provided at beginning of class = x; at end of class = y; at conclusion of practicum = n.

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.				xyn	
2) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).					xyn
3) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.	yn	x			
4) Learners bring a wealth of knowledge and experience about language learning to the classroom. Teachers simply facilitate skill development by creating an environment conducive to learning.		y	xn		
5) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.		yn		x	
6) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.	y	xn			
7) Cultural knowledge is essential in promoting effective communication. As a result, language teachers must incorporate activities to promote intercultural competence in their classrooms.				n	xy
8) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.				x	yn
9) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.		x		n	y
10) Teachers do not need to plan all activities in a lesson but must be flexible and able to adapt instruction based on students' performance in class.	y	n			x
11) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.		xn	y		
12) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.	y	n		x	

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
13) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.				xyn	
14) Culture is taught in social studies and learned when an individual travels to various countries. Therefore, time in a second language classroom should be spent learning the target language rather than culture.	yn	x			
15) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.				xn	y
16) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.			y	n	x
17) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.			xy	n	
18) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.			y	xn	
19) As the expert, the role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge to students through explanations, notes, activities, etc.			x	yn	
20) To facilitate effective learning, a brief presentation must set the direction for the lesson.				x	yn
21) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.			yn		x
22) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.					xyn
23) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.		x	yn		
24) Exercises/drills are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.		n	y	x	
25) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.			x	yn	
26) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.				xyn	

Appendix H: Catriona's Results from Pedagogical Beliefs Scale

Language Pedagogy Beliefs Scale

Response provided at beginning of class = x; at end of class = y; at conclusion of practicum = n.

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.		n		xy	
2) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).			x	yn	
3) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.		n		xy	
4) Learners bring a wealth of knowledge and experience about language learning to the classroom. Teachers simply facilitate skill development by creating an environment conducive to learning.				xyn	
5) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.		xyn			
6) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.		yn	x		
7) Cultural knowledge is essential in promoting effective communication. As a result, language teachers must incorporate activities to promote intercultural competence in their classrooms.				yn	x
8) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.		n	xy		
9) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.		x	y	n	
10) Teachers do not need to plan all activities in a lesson but must be flexible and able to adapt instruction based on students' performance in class.				xyn	
11) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.		y	n	x	
12) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.		yn	x		

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
13) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.			n	xy	
14) Culture is taught in social studies and learned when an individual travels to various countries. Therefore, time in a second language classroom should be spent learning the target language rather than culture.	yn	x			
15) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.				xyn	
16) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.		n	xy		
17) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.			xyn		
18) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.				xyn	
19) As the expert, the role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge to students through explanations, notes, activities, etc.			xyn		
20) To facilitate effective learning, a brief presentation must set the direction for the lesson.			y	xn	
21) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.		y	n	x	
22) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.		yn	x		
23) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.		n	x	y	
24) Exercises/drills are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.		x	yn		
25) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.			y	xn	
26) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.				xyn	

Appendix I: Deidra's Results from Pedagogical Beliefs Scale

Language Pedagogy Beliefs Scale

Response provided at beginning of class = x; at end of class = y; at conclusion of practicum = n.

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.		xyn			
2) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).		xyn			
3) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.		xyn			
4) Learners bring a wealth of knowledge and experience about language learning to the classroom. Teachers simply facilitate skill development by creating an environment conducive to learning.			x	yn	
5) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.		xyn			
6) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.		xyn			
7) Cultural knowledge is essential in promoting effective communication. As a result, language teachers must incorporate activities to promote intercultural competence in their classrooms.				xyn	
8) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.		x	yn		
9) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.		yn	x		
10) Teachers do not need to plan all activities in a lesson but must be flexible and able to adapt instruction based on students' performance in class.		yn		x	
11) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.			yn	x	
12) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.		x	yn		

Statement	**1 Strongly Disagree**	**2 Disagree**	**3 Neutral/ Uncertain**	**4 Agree**	**5 Strongly Agree**
13) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.				xyn	
14) Culture is taught in social studies and learned when an individual travels to various countries. Therefore, time in a second language classroom should be spent learning the target language rather than culture.		xyn			
15) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.				yn	x
16) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.				xyn	
17) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.			x	yn	
18) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.				yn	x
19) As the expert, the role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge to students through explanations, notes, activities, etc.				xyn	
20) To facilitate effective learning, a brief presentation must set the direction for the lesson.			x		yn
21) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.				xyn	
22) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.				xyn	
23) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.		x	yn		
24) Exercises/drills are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.		x	yn		
25) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.			x	yn	
26) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.				xyn	

Appendix J: Elisabeth's Results from Pedagogical Beliefs Scale

Language Pedagogy Beliefs Scale

Response provided at beginning of class = x; at end of class = y; at conclusion of practicum = n.

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.			x	yn	
2) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).			xyn		
3) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.		xyn			
4) Learners bring a wealth of knowledge and experience about language learning to the classroom. Teachers simply facilitate skill development by creating an environment conducive to learning.		x	yn		
5) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.		xyn			
6) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.		yn	x		
7) Cultural knowledge is essential in promoting effective communication. As a result, language teachers must incorporate activities to promote intercultural competence in their classrooms.				xyn	
8) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.			yn	x	
9) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.	yn	x			
10) Teachers do not need to plan all activities in a lesson but must be flexible and able to adapt instruction based on students' performance in class.				xyn	
11) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.			x	yn	
12) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.		x	yn		

Statement	1 Strongly Disagree	2 Disagree	3 Neutral/ Uncertain	4 Agree	5 Strongly Agree
13) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.			xyn		
14) Culture is taught in social studies and learned when an individual travels to various countries. Therefore, time in a second language classroom should be spent learning the target language rather than culture.	x	yn			
15) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.			yn		x
16) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.			xyn		
17) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.			xyn		
18) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.			yn	x	
19) As the expert, the role of the language teacher is to impart knowledge to students through explanations, notes, activities, etc.			yn	x	
20) To facilitate effective learning, a brief presentation must set the direction for the lesson.			xyn		
21) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.			xyn		
22) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.			x	yn	
23) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.			xyn		
24) Exercises/drills are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.		xyn			
25) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.		yn	x		
26) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.			x	yn	

Appendix K: TBLT Disposition Scale Cumulative Results

TBLT Disposition Scale:

Cumulative Results

Statement	**1 Strongly Disagree**	**2 Disagree**	**3 Neutral/ Uncertain**	**4 Agree**	**5 Strongly Agree**	**Mean Score**
1) Student errors must be regularly corrected in order to avoid bad habits.		14	10	21	7	3.4 (2.6)
2) Errors are a natural part of language learning (interlanguage development). Therefore, large amounts of correction are a waste of time.	2	20	11	16	3	3.0 (3.0)
3) Activities used in a language classroom ought to have a clear focus with predetermined outcomes.	1	9	15	20	7	3.4 (2.6)
4) The outcome of lessons is unpredictable because every student is unique and will cause the lesson to proceed in a different manner.	1	8	10	27	6	3.6 (2.4)
5) Explicit grammar instruction is an important element of any foreign language program.	3	7	13	27	2	3.3 (2.7)
6) Studying grammar promotes knowledge about language rather than the ability to use language. Therefore, explicit grammar instruction should be limited.		16	19	16	1	3.0 (3.0)
7) Group work activities are important for creating a cooperative environment in which students feel comfortable interacting with their peers. The genuine interaction created through group work activities is crucial in developing communicative competence.			2	28	22	4.4 (1.6)
8) Group work activities should be used sparingly because students learn each other's errors and spend more time goofing around and talking in the mother tongue, than productively completing tasks.	15	26	10	1		1.9 (4.1)
9) Drills are important for developing accuracy by promoting the formation of positive habits.		4	14	34		3.6 (2.4)

10) Exercises are useless because they don't develop skills/knowledge that can be transferred to real-life situations.	3	34	9	6		2.3 (3.7)
11) Activities are the most effective means to organize a syllabus.		3	35	14		3.2 (2.8)
12) Courses should be organized around progressively more difficult forms (grammatical concepts) or functions (greetings, requests, etc.).		5	11	27	9	3.8 (2.2)
13) Since learners enter into the classroom with little or no knowledge about the target language, they are not in a position to suggest what the content of the lesson should be or what activities are useful for their learning.	15	26	7	3	1	2.0 (4.0)
14) Tasks and activities should be negotiated and adapted to suit the students' needs rather than exclusively determined by the teacher.		1	5	24	22	4.3 (1.7)
15) Training students to take responsibility for their own learning is futile because they do not have the maturity to direct their own learning.	16	25	5	6		2.0 (4.0)
16) Since each student enters the language classroom with different skills, knowledge and learning abilities, the language teacher must help them develop individual strategies for improving their learning.			5	36	11	4.1 (1.9)
17) Grammatical correctness is the most important criterion by which language performance should be judged.	11	33	7	1		2.0 (4.0)
18) The main focus of language programs is to develop students who are able to communicate fluently.	2	8	15	22	5	3.4 (2.6)
19) For most students language is acquired best when used as a vehicle for doing a task rather than studied in an explicit manner.		1	13	29	9	3.9 (2.1)
20) Explicit knowledge about grammatical forms and rules is essential in learning a language.	1	10	23	16	2	3.2 (2.8)

*The number in brackets represents the result if the reverse scale were used. This number is used to compare the accuracy of responses to the paired statements. Moreover, the reverse scale is used for negative statements in determining the TBLT disposition scale score.

** Shaded boxes represent statements that demonstrate a positive disposition towards TBLT. The associated statement that is not shaded shows a belief that is not coherent with the principles of TBLT.

Mean of Positive Disposition Traits – 3.5 (35.2 total)

Mean of Negative Disposition Traits – 2.9 (28.6 total)

Disposition towards the use of TBLT:

Maximum score = 100
Minimum score = 20

Average Score = 67

Student Teacher Dispositions:

Elisabeth
Initial = 57

Post Class = 57

Post Practicum = 57

Deidra
Initial = 65

Post Class = 66

Post Practicum = 66

Catriona
Initial = 59

Post Class = 69

Post Practicum = 68

Brooke
Initial = 54

Post Class = 66

Post Practicum = 65

Annika

Initial = 55

Post Class = 86

Post Practicum = 85

Appendix L: Effect of Class on Disposition Towards TBLT

Course Effect on TBLT Disposition Scores

	TDS Score	
Student Name (Pseudonym Used)	At Beginning of Course	After Course
1) Elisabeth	57	57
2) Deidra	65	65
3) Catriona	59	69
4) Brooke	54	66
5) Annika	55	86
6) Fiona	65	67
7) Gavin	53	63
8) Heidi	66	69
9) Jacob	86	81
10) Kristin	64	75
11) Laura	67	74
12) Meredith	62	69
Average	62.8	70.1
Score on eighty-point scale	42.8	50.1

**On an eighty-point scale this marks an increase of 17% in students' disposition towards the use of TBLT.